

1963 PRYNCE HOPKINS

PRINTED IN INDIA

BY D. D. KARKARIA AT LEADERS PRESS
PRIVATE LIMITED, BOMBAY AND PUBLISHED BY P. S.
JAYASINGHE, ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, BOMBAY.

PREFACE

I was invited to give a course of five lectures on psychology at the University of Madras in the spring term of 1961. Dr. Chandrasekhar, the well-known economist and demographer, who was my host during this visit asked me then whether he might submit the manuscript of these lectures to Asia Publishing House for their consideration. This has resulted in the present book. The lectures were intended for an audience of students at large from whom any previous acquaintance with psychology was not to be expected. I therefore have avoided all technical jargon and tried to explain as I went along all matters with which they might not be familiar. Within these limitations and that of the time allowed me, I have attempted a rather ambitious survey of the aspects of the psychological field which seemed most likely to appeal to the theoretical, but still more the practical, interests of my young audience.

The first lecture deals with the acquisition of knowledge and its communication. The second two deal with the application of psychological principles to the problems of politics, industry and the family. The final two consider it in its connections with recreation, culture and mental health.

I must beg the readers forgiveness if, in my desire to cover so wide a field it has not always been possible to do the fullest justice to all the issues involved.

P. HOPKINS

ORIENTATION

THE KEY to motivating a modern morality is a scientific psychology. So far as we have positive knowledge, there is an inseparable connection between human ways of acting, feeling, and thinking on the one hand, and our neuromuscular organism on the other.

When a seed is stimulated by moisture and sunlight, it thrusts one or more cotyledons upwards towards the light and sends roots downward into the nourishing soil. In like manner, each new human being thrusts upward its effector, and downward its sensory, system.

Our effector system consists physiologically of the motor areas of the brain and the efferent, or outgoing, nerves from it thru the spinal cord and to the muscles. Psychologically it consists of our reflexes, instincts, and urges and on the habits, attitudes and ambitions which have developed from them. According to the "metapsychology" which psychology's greatest genius, Sigmund Freud, developed in his speculative moments, the most archaic of all urges is what he calls the "repetition-compulsion". This drives us always to try to re-mold new circumstances into a semblance of those we experienced at an earlier period—even those of our pre-natal nine months in the womb.

From the repetition-compulsion spring Eros, the creative or life-force; and Thanatos, the "destructive or death-instinct". The latter is very controversial. Most psychologists reject it and say that our emotions of anger and jealousy and our sentiment of hate are not inborn but are like the retreat-mechanisms of disgust, flight and fear, mere reactions set up when one of our positive appetites has been frustrated. Freud, however, puts forth strong

which makes children cruel, derives satisfaction from the suffering of others and our own martyrdom; is responsible for tyranny and war, and finally induces our own decay and death. Actually it makes little practical difference which view we accept, because frustrations and pain, and therefore, anger begin for every infant with the fearful trauma of being forced thru its mother's pelvis into the cold world and are part of the many disciplines of childhood. So much for Thanatos, except that afterwards it makes strange and macabre combinations with Eros, such as sadism and masochism.

Now as to Eros. From it are derived on the one hand, the biologically-maintaining reflexes, instincts and such urges as food-getting, shelter seeking and flight from danger. There stems also, from Eros, the Libido or sexuality; Freud denied the common belief that this springs into existence suddenly out of nothing at puberty. He substituted the conception of a force developing from our birth thru major stages (all with sub-divisions): the auto-erotic finding pleasures in zones of the body; the narcissistic, pleased with one's own beauty; and the allo-erotic, turned outwards to other persons. At this level we have, therefore, four arch-urges—the positive biologically maintaining, the negative biologically maintaining (flight and fear), the libido in its several stages, and Thanatos.

Of special interest is the libido. As I said, it first passes thru the auto-erotic stage. The subdivisions of that are two levels of oral erotism—where sucking and biting respectively bring orgiastic degrees of pleasure; then two of anal erotism where pleasure is taken respectively in excretion and retention of faeces; and then the urethro-genital levels where urination and above all masturbation are the pleasure-bringers.

The libido—or most of it—continues to progress thru the

narcissistic (self-loving) stage which gives much of its power to "self preservation" and the "ego instincts", as well as exhibitionism-scoptophilia (liking to display and to look at the sex-organs).

In the allo-erotic stage, it passes thru homo-sexuality (love of members of one's own sex) to hetero-sexuality (love of members of the other sex).

These libidinous developments, together with the positive and negative biological needs, urges, and Thanatos and with the efferent chains of nerves, are like the fibres and strands forming the trunk of a tree—the Tree of Life.

Leaving now this glance at our motivating system, we need to take a slightly longer look at our afferent or receptor apparatus. Its neural part consists of a set of receptor organs which are so affected by events in the physical world as to initiate a series of nervous discharges in an afferent chain of nerve cells, whereby a wave of such discharge travels thru the spinal cord to enter the central system, the pons, the cerebellum and the cerebrum. It eventually exits thru a chain of efferent fibres already described. Of course, the popular expression "the five senses" should be altered to read "*five groups of senses*", since really in the central nervous system we can count more than eighteen, mostly distinguished by special sense-organs and each leading to a specific brain area. Let us count them. The so-called "sense of touch" includes specialized organs and nerves for tactile, pressure, pain, warmth (which, when added to pain, gives the sense of heat) joint-tendonous, and inner malaise sensations—say six. The "sense of taste" has special buds in the tongue for sweetness, bitterness, acidity or sourness, and saltiness or metallic flavour—three more senses though complicated (as in oleaginous foods) by tactile and temperature sensations. What are commonly spoken of as tastes actually are largely smells, as shown by the fact that if we shut our eyes and hold our nose we

are unable to tell whether an experimenter has put into our mouth a slice of apple or of raw onion.

The kinds of smell which we can distinguish: burnt, spicy, resinous, putrid, fragrant and ethereal—Henning has enumerated them—are probably as many as six. "Hearing" may have to be broken up into capacities for hearing as many different notes as there are specific lengths of vibrissae in the semi-circular canals, the fluid in which is caused to undulate by the inner ear-drum, and I know of no one who has measured them all. Finally, "sight" consists of white-black, yellow-blue, and red-green vision—three in all. Thus, without counting the varieties of hearing, we have at least $6 + 3 + 6 + 3 = 18$, senses.

We are now in a position to carry our tree simile further. We may say that the senses conventionally grouped into those of skin and viscera, of the tongue, of the nose, of the ear and of the eye, are five roots of the Life Tree, which bring it salts from the environment. We may liken the central brain to the foliage which transforms these salts. We may give to the trunk—of which the fibres or gnarled strands represent the motor tendencies—three main branches, corresponding to the customary division of psychological energies into the conative or striving, the affective or feeling and emoting, and the cognitive or thinking.

Indeed the Greek letter *psi*, very like a three-branched tree, is centrally featured on the cover of the *American Psychologist*, Official journal of our Psychological Association, as the symbol of our science. In naming its branches Cognition, Conation and Affection, however, we must not forget that each branch of the tree is associated with the others, being one aspect of the life-force which manifests itself primitively in reflexes, tropisms, instincts and urges. Remember MacDougal's definition of an instinct as an inborn tendency to *take an interest* in objects of a particular

class, and to *act* and to *feel* in a characteristic way about them.

Parenthetically, the tree seems a "natural" symbol of a process of growth—and that is what life is. The Tree of Life has been depicted in religious iconography from the Babylonian times onwards. Charles Spearman, the distinguished head under whom I taught for many years in the Department of Psychology at University College, London, used to depict various aspects or specialisms of psychology by a crude tree.

Because your attending to the present verbal exposition of a thesis is itself an intellectual activity, it will be most convenient for us to deal first with the cognitive branch of the life-tree and with the sensory roots which supply it with nourishment.

The *acuity* of our senses can be enormously increased by special conditions (such as the prolonged training of the sailor in detecting ships on the horizon or of the trapper in noting the tracks or spoor of animals) ; or, under hypnosis. Indeed, the keenness of animals within a special field far exceeds that of a man, whose eye is less able to detect small carrion from the sky than that of the eagle ; whose ear is deaf to a sound of mice which at once alerts the cat ; and whose nose cannot follow a trail as can that of a blood-hound. Consequently, when we come up against an example of such unusual acuity, we regard it as uncanny. A famous case was that in Germany of the horse, Der Kluge Hans, investigated by Muensterberg. This horse apparently performed feats of mental arithmetic and of mind-reading and these without his owner being anywhere in sight. Der Kluge Hans signalled his answers by pawing. Muensterberg found, however, that the horse was only successful if he could see the faces of his audience or hear their breathing. He had been trained into abnormal sensitivity to these slight cues. Many fortune-tellers and "mind readers"

know whether they are on the right track thru having developed an unconscious hypersensitivity to telltale flushing of the face or muscular tensions or changed breathing in their clients.

Nor is it sure that all the kinds of sense-organs which our bodies and brains include have been already discovered by science. Bats apparently possess in connection with their whiskers an organ sensitive to the rebounding of their high-pitched squeaks from nearby hard surfaces, on the analogy of radar, which enable them to fly safely in complete darkness. Fish have a row of sense organs along their sides the function of which may be to help them estimate depth. Ants apparently are able, by touching each others' feelers, to transmit knowledge of the whereabouts of food. So it is conceivable that within our own human bodies there are organs as yet unidentified, sensitive to other forms of stimulus than the mechanical or chemical, and to other vibrations than those of sound or light—for instance, to variations in the magnetic or electronic fields. This possibility might seem a way of explaining, without recourse to mystical hypotheses, some of the alleged phenomena of telepathy. We must note, however, that all forms of radiation weaken as the square of the distance from a center, whereas it is claimed for telepathy that this is effective regardless of distance. Telepathy cannot, therefore, be a form of vibration.

Telepathy, clairvoyance, and the like have in recent years received much support from the experiments of Dr. Rhine at Duke University, so that you will hear the claim made that Psychology now accepts these as proven. Most of the work of Rhine and his supporters has been done in a truly scientific spirit, nor have the objections sometimes made to his mathematical techniques been justified. However, there is reason to believe that the *tallying* of their results has been influenced by a human factor, namely that persons

who investigate this field are generally those desirous of proving telepathy true and consequently make more errors in favor of than against this view. This is confirmed where, as at Yale University, movie cameras were secretly installed in the ceiling of the room where the experiments were conducted. While, therefore no one can guess what future discoveries will be made, we are not at present justified in assuming that there are any channels thru which knowledge comes to us—any other roots of life's tree—than our eighteen or more kinds of physical sense organs.

The nerve impulses which come in from these sense organs are apparently waves of chemical change which pass along them as a spark passes along a fuse, except only that the original chemical composition of the nerve is at once restored by physiological processes. The impulse has also been likened to a tiny explosion. Like a Leyden jar, it is an all-or-nothing process—it does not occur until the stimulus has reached a certain intensity.

In the simplest animals, and in ourselves in the case of mere reflexes, the series of explosions travels to the pons or cerebellum or merely the spinal cord and directly out again to the muscle to be effected. In more complex cases, the series travels via the cerebrum and apparently enters into whorls and circles from which it issues only after some delay, if at all. This is as near as we have come to explaining memory. Psychological events accompany at least the higher stages of the physiological nervous process of which we have spoken thus far. What the connection is between the two remains a mystery. Most psychologists of my acquaintance incline to the "two-aspect view" that mind and matter are two inseparable sides of ultimate reality. Until techniques of investigation have advanced beyond any we have today, however, this question is not one for psychology, physics or other science but for philosophy if not for religion.

There is a hierarchy of these things. Of you who are listening to me, some may take my words religiously, as did Mohammed listening while Gabriel dictated the *Koran*. Others will take them philosophically, as starting point for disputation, as Socrates picked on the pretensions of his co-citizens of Athens. A third group will take them scientifically, as hypotheses the probability of which must be checked by experiments and statistics. Of this last group, some will check especially their social factuality; others, their claims to psychological insight.

Everyone of these attitudes has its peculiar merit, which should not be scorned. The merit of religion is zeal; that of philosophy is judiciousness; that of general science is verification; that of the social is pertinency to our human problems; and that of psychology, insight.

For those of you who listen to me in the religious spirit, playing Mohammed to my Gabriel, here are a few rules by which your zeal may reap its greatest profit—the rules for effective study.

Take notes, yes, emphatically yes! The process is necessary in order to keep you from day-dreaming—or drowsing—and also in order that you may review the material later. If you are tired, better attend only half these lectures and make well organised notes than attend them all passively. Learning cannot be passive. But not notes of every word nor phrase. Let your mind actively play around what I am saying in order to grasp the outline, the skeleton of this lecture. Let your notes be in the form of headings and sub-headings. Budget your time just as you budget—or ought to budget—your spending money; no worthwhile person ever has enough of either one to meet all needs.

Rule a sheet of paper vertically for the days of the week and horizontally for hours of each day—or *vice versa*. First put down such things as lectures, classes and laboratory periods and perhaps meals, the hour for which is fixed for

you. Then fit in the hours for preparation for each specific topic of study. But include also for every day a definite period for outdoor exercise to restore the mind-body balance. Your temptation will be to place the study-period for each subject immediately before its recitation period. Unfortunately this induces a mental attitude of learning for only immediate reproduction, so that when exams come, at the end of the semester, you will have forgotten it all. No ; study each subject, or review your notes, as soon as possible *after* the class or lecture period, when you know you must retain it, and when any *interest* aroused by the class discussion is strongest. I do not recommend to you length of hours of study. Far better it is to feel that your time is hardly adequate, so that you must work with speed and utmost concentration every moment. The fast worker retains more, and not less, of what he reads, because speed creates excitement and requires attention.

Begin with the advance lesson, not the review, or you may find you are always one lesson behind. Begin by glancing rapidly over the whole, seizing its main points. Then go over it in more detail. Then run thru the review and finish with another quick survey because of the value of repetition.

Although there are other useful rules for study, these I believe to be the essential ones, and if you remember and apply them with zeal, I guarantee they will pull up your grades.

Now, however, I must turn from the uncritical absorption of knowledge to the problems of judgment, and deal with those of you who come to me not as Mohammed to accept the words of Gabriel but as Socrates to prick the conceit of your fellow.

The great work of Aristotle was, to elaborate a system of laws of logic. It was the emphasis on the step by step process of reasoning which constituted the major intellec-

tual contribution of Greece (we may say, more narrowly, of the city of Athens) to western civilizations. Graeco-Roman philosophy was all too soon engulfed by the inrush of mystery cults, and the universities were closed by a Christian emperor. However, when the Muslim Arabs found themselves involved in arguments with the Christians, able dialecticians arose among them who eagerly seized, preserved, translated, and built upon the Greeks—on Aristotle especially. After the Crusades, the works of such Arabian Philosophers as Avicenna becoming known in Europe started a western revival to Aristotle. Thomas Aquinas was the clever doctor of the Church who affected a reconciliation between Aristotle and Christianity by declaring reason to be man's proper guide up to but not beyond the point where it conflicted with revealed Christian doctrine.

From that point onward, thru and beyond the mediaeval period, Catholic Christianity has been strongly rationalistic—deductively based, of course, on "revealed" assumptions. Aristotle's *Logic* became the very backbone of the philosophic and theological training of the European universities.

The nature of intelligence was the problem to which my former chief on the psychological staff of University College, London, devoted himself. An expert in statistical methods of handling experimental data, he pretty well established the existence of a factor of general intelligence, Spearman's famous *g*, in addition to which there are also factors of ability in special fields.

In his *magnum opus* on *Intelligence*, he maintains that *g* is governed by three qualitative laws and five which are quantitative. The qualitative laws state that :

1. Every experience we have tends to give rise to an awareness of it.
2. Awareness of two objects tends to give rise to a sense of relationship between them.

3. Awareness of one object and a relationship tends to educe the idea of a correlate.

The quantitative laws of g are as below. The total amount of intellectual energy under given conditions is a constant, depending on such factors as :

1. The primordial energy which the individual inherited.
2. His age, sex, state of health, etc.
3. Facilitation thru habit-formation.
4. Fatigue.
5. Conative Control.

This fifth factor leads us back to the importance, for an understanding of the intellectual processes, of the work of Professor Sigmund Freud. The instinctive nature of curiosity had, of course, long been recognized ; one has but to observe for a little while the activities of one's household cat, to see it at work. Freud found that in humans this tendency was powerfully reinforced by a libido-component.

You will recall that in outlining to you the Freudian scheme of drives, I listed last among the auto-erotic impulses—those, that is to say, which are concerned with the child's own body—one bearing the hyphenated name, exhibitionism-scoptophilia. As a stage passed thru by every child it is quite normal. It consists at its crudest in a craving to look at one's own sexual parts. Presently the craving splits into a passive and an active component. The passive, exhibitionism, is the desire to have the parts looked at. The active is the desire to look.

When auto-eroticisms persist unchanged into adulthood, we name them (sexual) "perversions". An adult who still primitively gets orgiastic pleasure from having his sex organs looked at we call an exhibitionist. One who gets such pleasure from looking at the sexual organs of

others we call a *voyeur* or a peeping Tom. Usually, however, in order to pass as socially acceptable, the crude impulse takes on a commendable disguised form, known as a "sublimation".

Exhibitionism then becomes a showing off of one's pretty clothes or one's achievements. Scopophilia becomes an interest in the anatomy or behavior of animals and finally in general ideas. So it combines with curiosity of whatever other origin to become the paramount motivation of philosophy and science.

Science! Yes, now we can come to that crowning discipline in man's attempt to advance the reliability of his knowledge.

We find the rudiments of science among the ancients, *e g.* in Aristotle's classification of the immense store of animals and plants which Alexander the Great sent him from every part of the world, and his induction of generalities from his scrutiny of these. The ancients made little further advance, though, because of their snobbery, which relegated the handling of mechanical instruments to persons of low social standing. With Kepler we see the coming in of ground lenses, leading to observations by which archaic views could be checked; and Bacon gives the modern idea of science its first formulation.

As we would express it today, science continues the concern of philosophy in meticulous accuracy of stating truths of ever more general applicability to experience. Its advance over philosophy consists in the invention of new techniques, mechanical and mathematical, by which possibilities of error can be avoided, or the likelihood of such errors can itself be stated mathematically. In particular, it advances from sensory data to the formulation of the simplest hypothesis which will explain them all; it predicts consequences which would necessarily follow from specific conditions if the rule were true; it devises an ex-

periment or a statistical procedure which excludes all factors but the relevant ones, and then it watches to see if results justify the prediction or not. If not, a new hypothesis must be evolved and similarly tested.

Scientific technique varies from science to science. The demands for a rigid mathematical formulation and experimental procedure which are possible in physics and chemistry must be relaxed, though still approximated, in the social sciences because of the more complex and less tangible nature of the material. Thus, in the field of biosociology, while the Law of Malthus to the effect that population increases in geometric ratio while food supply increases arithmetically is doubtless roughly true, its exact working out in any particular country is modified by innumerable factors, such as the incidence of floods and epidemics, the contemporary death-rate, industrial goods exchanged for food raised in other lands, etc.

Psychology had to undergo a transition in status from being the mere branch of speculative philosophy which it was until less than a century ago, to become an experimental science. This movement was inaugurated in Germany in the laboratories of Hering, Fehner, von Helmholtz and Wundt. In America, the older school, modified by introspectionism, found its swan-song in William James' *Principles* before the new was inaugurated by German-trained men such as Tichner and McKeen Cattell (under whom I trained at Columbia). The reaction against philosophy and even introspection swung to its extreme in Watson's behaviorism, which admitted nothing whatever except what an external experimenter could record mechanically.

The reverse swing, together with a change of interest from the intellectual to the orectic (willing and feeling) processes came in with MacDougal's hormic psychology; his *Social Psychology* gave James' theory of instinct a brilliant development. A greater force in the same direction was the

rise of clinical psychology, which made evident the overwhelming importance for human affairs of our drives and emotions.

At the turn of the century there arose the genius who was to be to psychology what Darwin was to biology—Sigmund Freud. This eminence he will retain even if his specific theories should be proven false. Ernest Jones, Freud's great biographer and my own psycho-analyst, in the paper he read in London on the centenary of Freud's death, defined intellectual genius in terms of the discovery of a new principle, by the applications of which future investigators find their fields of research illuminated. Freud, in searching for a method of curing his psycho-neurotic patients, invented the technique called Free Association, which has opened to us a door to the unconscious, fruitful not only for psycho-therapy but for anthropology, sociology and all the sciences of man. On this rests his claim to genius.

We have summarized the principle human drives at what Freud calls the *id* level. He postulates on a more mature level than the *id*, the ego, formed by our experiences of the real world. The *id* does not reckon with obstacles; the *ego* takes them into account. The morality of the *id* is that of the pleasure-seeking Epicurean concerned only to avoid self-injury or public disgrace. Socially, it gives rise at highest to what anthropologists call a "shame-culture". The third stage is that of the *super-ego*, where one has taken over into himself and made his own the injunctions, commands and exhortations of his parents and of society. The echo of their voices he calls "conscience", and when he goes contrary to this he suffers from a sense of guilt, sin, or low self-esteem. A society in which this type is prevalent is known as a "guilt-culture".

It must be noted that the super-ego and the guilt culture are "civilized" but not necessarily always good. They rise no higher than the wisdom—and the prejudices—of

our elders. Above all three stages is the stage of individualism—towards that, however, we must work gradually, to deal with it in our final discourse.

Instead, one more of Freud's seeming compartmentalizations of the mind must be considered. I say, seeming, because he realized that mind is really a moving process and that topographical analogies are for purposes of illustration only. All psychological drives first enter what he calls the *foreconscious*, which is a kind of limbo, the denizens of which are at liberty to enter the conscious at any time they are called on. By "the conscious" Freud means the central stream of thoughts and emotions of which we are aware, and to which the foreconscious is an ante-room. If these thoughts and emotions are beyond a certain measure disharmonious with or offensive to our complacency, a mechanism he calls the "censor" condemns them to the "unconscious" and holds them there against all efforts at recall. But although we are no longer aware of them, and, indeed, all the more powerfully for being out of control, they continue to command our conduct.

Before concluding this sketch of Freudian dynamics I must explain a few consequences of the *conflict* of motives or emotions which relegates one of them to *the unconscious*. If a strong unconscious drive impels us to an act which we are ashamed to acknowledge to ourself as our own, we may *project* our attitude upon someone else, by claiming that it is not we who hate and try to injure him but he who is trying to injure us. Or we may *transfer* on to B the love or hate which we really feel towards A; or we may *rationalize* the situation by saying and believing that we did it from a quite different and more creditable motive.

All these unhealthy mechanisms, when carried too far, destroy sanity. The last of them especially—that of rationalization—poisons our very reasoning powers themselves. And this thought leads me to make a short digression.

Every species of animal which has at some time attained a degree of dominance over the earth, was able to reach that eminence because it had developed great strength in some organ or function. When by a kind of biological momentum, however, this organ or function continued to grow out of proportion to other organs and functions, it became a handicap to the species, threatening its very survival. Examples are found in the monsters of the carboniferous age whose sheer size and strength made them the terrors of their time but also led to their extinction when the lush swamps dried up. Or there were the saber-toothed tigers whose canine teeth, that were useful earlier as deadly weapons, came, on further growth, to interfere fatally with feeding. Or there were the mammoths, whose tusks, growing so long as to curl backwards, became handicaps in the struggle for survival.

To believe that mankind will escape from this general law is naive. The essential difference in kind (as against degree) between him and even his cousins the apes—the quality which it is doubtful if any other animal possesses unless some recent experiments prove porpoises to be an exception—is the power to think in terms of symbols. For upon symbolic thinking is developed speech ; upon speech, culture ; and upon culture, science and progress. But if the physico-chemical sciences continue to put deadlier weapons in our hands while psychological sciences, lagging far behind, permit us to remain petulant children playing with lethal weapons in an overcrowded nursery—then tragedy is in sight. Man's need to correct immediately this lopsided development makes more psychological insight imperative.

II

FORMS TAKEN BY HOSTILITY

IN MY first lecture, I gave some summary account of man's instinctive and sensory equipment. I then endeavored to point out how the senses and higher nervous system, working in the service of curiosity and scopophilia, build up man's orientations, his beliefs, philosophy, general science, the social sciences and psychology.

Many animals are so well-equipped for the struggle for existence that they can manage quite alone or with the assistance of a mate. Most reptiles are solitary and, so are, among mammals, the cat tribe (lions partly excepted) and some others. The largest number of insects, fishes, birds and mammals can survive only by cooperating in swarms or packs. Man is physically the weakest of all animals and the least able to manage without help from his fellows.

Now, the price which society exacts for its help is socialization. Nor can we refuse to pay this price. From the time we were infants, there rang in our ears the parental admonitions: "You must do this!" "You must never do that!" "For doing this, you have a right to feel proud!" "For doing that you should hide your head in shame!" At first, we obey when we will be seen and disobey without compunction when we hope not to be caught—we are in the half-way or savage, stage, the "shame-culture" stage. An efficient moral education, however, will not let us rest until we have made the admonitions part of our super-ego, and reached the civilized, the guilt-culture stage. We have then surrendered the capacity to be happy in anti-social behavior; and the sensible thing is to be matter-of-fact about it. Instead of "kicking against the pricks", the realist will admit that social morality has got him on its hook and will

relax and try to enjoy it. What happens if after a severe attempt he is unable so to relax and enjoy is a question for the developmental stage still higher than socialization, namely individuation, the discussion of which I have reserved from our final talk.

This socialization process cannot be carried far without the aid of speech, any more than can the transmission to others of the other component of culture, knowledge.

Nearly all of the higher animals have developed a vocal apparatus capable of emitting sounds as a means of conveying emotion or information to others. Their scream of fright alerts the pack to danger or the need of help. Their roar of anger frightens an enemy and encourages their companions. Their love-call arouses amorous response.

These powers are retained by the human voice. Additionally, it has a greater flexibility than that of most lower animals because in the human face and throat the muscles which controlled the gill apparatus thru which our aquatic ancestors breathed, having millions of years ago lost that primitive function, assumed with particular efficiency the new function of emotional expression. This apparatus of articulation combined well with the human power of symbolism which has been referred to, to make our species capable of speech.

If speech is the basis of culture, we see why it is the first thing which needs to be socialized ; but in what respects ? And psychologically how ? In respect, I suggest, of its adequacy and quality, its truthfulness, its freedom from malice, its courteousness and the edifying quality of its contents. Let me proceed to discuss their psychology *seriatum*.

By the "adequacy" of our speech, I mean "correctness and precision in the use of the mother tongue", the number of languages we know, our vocabulary and fluency in each, and whatever else increases our capacity to convey ideas.

By its quality, I mean chiefly its freedom from strident, nasal or guttural elements or monotony of tone, or lisping or stuttering and the presence of richness, variety and charm.

"Correctness and precision" in speech are indications that the speaker is a person of education and probably from an educated family. When carried to excess, of course these traits may betray a pedantic or puritanic streak in the speaker. In England, it is a point of pride to assume the accent of Oxford or Cambridge as an indication of membership in upper class society. In America, however, the urge is so strong towards conformity that everyone is terrified to speak in a way that might be interpreted as snobbish.

A small child is much frustrated by his incapacity to communicate his wishes to others. To him, therefore, language-facility, such as adults have, stands for potency. The analysis of cases of stuttering has shown this to be a symptom expressive of the patient's fear of impotence.

The same association and the power they have over crowds account for the admiration which people have always had for great orators and, in a lesser degree, for persons who speak a large number of foreign languages.

Stridency of tone and tension of the throat muscles are the natural accompaniment of general neuro-muscular tension. This is characteristic of life in present-day America, hence my countrymen and women are peculiarly marked by their shrill voices. Monotony of voice symbolizes the repression of spontaneity, such as characterizes too many modern lives ; whereas a rich, varied and charming voice implies a happy combination of spontaneity and wish to please the other person.

Hinduism and Buddhism forbid lying and Judaism and Christianity profess a commandment against false witness. These are tacit evidences of the fact that the temptation to deceive is very great in human nature. The five motives most

commonly responsible for lying are imagination, secretiveness, fear, hate, and the hope of profit.

I begin with the lie out of imagination because it is the most innocent and least likely to cause trouble. The small child easily confuses his own phantasies with reality, relating the former as factual occurrences. The parent should treat these stories as amusing but impress on the child that in relating them he should make clear what they really are. To take too much interest in his tales will *add* for him the incentive of getting attention to that of fantasy. To punish him at this stage will only push him into the third and more objectionable kind of prevarication—that from fear.

The lie told from the motive of secretiveness is not too generally recognized. Children are very quick to see thru the behavior of their parents. Parents obtusely go on, keeping facts from children, telling lies in front of them, and even lying brazenly to them. In the face of such practice, their preachments to the children to be truthful fall on deaf ears. The children counter by having their own secrets away from the parents. They resist the attempts of the parents to obtain their confidence. They lie to them as they have been lied to, or better the lesson.

The lie from fear is too familiar to need much explanation. The children who are most prone to lying are precisely those who are punished a great deal and so are rendered cowardly and full of constant dread of letting their wickedness be known. The "polite lie" is a more easily excused type within the same class; we escape the unpleasantness or inconvenience of having to entertain an unwelcome guest by getting him or her to believe that we have another engagement.

The lies from hate are the most vicious kind because they are deliberately aimed to get someone into trouble. In children, they proceed usually from jealousy of siblings

who are getting a major share of the parent's love or of playmates who are more popular. Because of its importance, I will come back to this kind of lying later.

There remains the lie from hope of profit. Among children, though this occurs, it is less frequent than among adults who, naturally, are more concerned with gain. This type of lying I also will deal with, a little later.

Within the limits of truthfulness, speech may, however, still lack human feeling. Jealousy and hate of an individual or even generalized aggressivity are what make the scandal-monger, the assassin of character. Such persons soon become known for what they are, and are hated in their community. They are also feared, however, which gratifies vanity.

A form of anti-social speech which is less vicious but decidedly unpleasant is that of lack of courtesy. Discourtesy so quickly thwarts a person in his objectives that it is hard to understand why anyone ever indulges in it. The answer is, that the strength of their aggressivity blinds them to the way they are harming themselves at the same time that it weakens their powers of self-control.

The more positive quality, courtesy, can be cultivated and made habitual. It is richly rewarding as a maker of friends and a lubricant to the machinery of life through arousing friendliness towards one from the other party.

Finally, socialization has the task of turning the unprofitable use of communication, known as gossip, into the profitable types such as education in its two forms, instruction and exhortation.

Education differs from propaganda. The latter is interested only in its success in getting us to think and act in predetermined ways regardless of the participation in the process of our reason. Education, on the other hand, scrupulously lays all the facts on the table before us, and solicits our fair assessment of them. The psychology of instruction

deserves to be the backbone of every course in the training of future teachers.

And now I am nearly ready to return to the further discussion I promised you of the "lie from hate". As, however, a lie, or a piece of propaganda proceeding from this motive can have its deadliest effects only where it falls on soil which is itself at least latently hateful, I wish first to say a few words on the role of hate in the community and the world.

The small child is a little barbarian whose socializing requires him to relinquish a host of sadistic, jealous and aggressive pleasures. He may not pull the cat's tail, nor punch the nose of his small brother, nor throw a tantrum, nor break the furniture, nor answer his parents defiantly. Sometimes he can drive his father or mother, who is continually telling him what to do and is supposed to set him a good example, into an ill-controlled fit of rage. This gratifies his lust for power. If he is given a spanking, this may depress his most immediate anti-social behavior but the anger which he has to repress does not simply evaporate. It is stored in his unconscious mind, someday to be vented on someone else over whom he has power.

Sometimes the problem of life becomes greater than a young person can meet. There is perhaps hardly any misfortune but you may find some person who has found a way to weather it. Nevertheless each of the following is *likely* to result in moral breakdown which may not stop short of delinquency and crime, namely : being rejected by one or both parents, parental drunkenness or criminality, absence of moral training, excessive moralizing, harsh punishments, infidelity between the parents, quarrelling parents, inconsistent attitudes on what is allowed or forbidden, harsh treatment by older siblings, injustice in the home, bad playmates and gangs, or corruption by vicious adults.

If a young person becomes delinquent, the treatment he receives may only confirm him in crime. This is the case where it results in loss of self-respect, association with older more experienced criminal companions, formation of evil friendships, planning for crimes to be committed after time has been served, or embitterment against society.

The endeavor of modern criminology is to avoid any such catastrophe by understanding the delinquent's problem and proceeding in a sympathetic and scientific way to recover him for normal social living.

During his period of detention, his conduct is studied and his disposition reported on ; and a psychological examination may be made to determine his intelligence and normality. He is not given the undesirable publicity of a public trial but is tried in a small room with few persons present besides the judge or judges, members of his family, lawyers, and his probation-officer. The judge has before him reports on conditions in his home, etc.

If in the judge's view a term in reformatory is desirable, the youth probably lives in a cottage under a sympathetic supervisory parental couple, attends school in the morning and in the afternoon learns some useful trade. Other reformatory influences which may be brought in are the religious and the psychological. With older criminals, also, more understanding and scientific treatment is gaining acceptance and the results in diminished recidivism justify this.

Why has progress in applying enlightened penology been so slow ? I think the answer must be found in the fact that sadism and vengefulness are no monopoly of the criminal class. They exist in all of us, beneath the surface. We can turn them against the criminal without inhibition by rationalizing that we are only protecting society.

A safer outlet than criminality, though much akin to it, is found by the aggressive tendencies when they form a

reinforcement of narcissism, to yield ethnic intolerance and the persecution of groups other than our own. The phenomena are psychologically related, whether they take the form of the ancient Hamitic Egyptians' hatred of what are called on their monuments "the vile Kush", or the contempt of the South-Mongolian ancestors of the Japanese for the Caucasian Ainu aborigines of their islands, or the caste system as it developed and degenerated in your own India, or the segregationism of the whites in South Africa or in backward corners of my own United States.

In each case, the issue is complicated by historical accidents which have given sometimes one, sometimes another group military or economic power and the culture and the status which they convey, or have created specific animosities. Before I touch on deeper-lying psychological factors I will mention a few of the sociological ones as they are seen in my own country, in order that you may perhaps condemn us a little less. It is notable that prejudices are strongest in the culturally most backward section of America, the south eastern.

Here the group of lowest social status is the Negro. His ancestors were primitive tribesmen in Africa, captured in raids on their villages by fellow Africans, to sell them as slaves. In time, Portugese traders saw a profit in buying these slaves to re-sell in the west ; and this trade was later taken over by the British and others, though the British were the first to see its immorality, to make slavery unlawful, and to free slaves in their dominions with compensation to their owners.

When America became an independent nation, the framers of the constitution were embarrassed by the conflict between our democratic aspirations and the persistence of slavery among us. The institution died out in the industrialized north because it could not compete economically with free labor. In the south also it was declining until

Whitney's invention of the cotton gin and the great demand for cotton by the mills of Manchester. Cotton was a crop which could be harvested most cheaply by large slave gangs under a ruthless overseer.

The economic urge now so paralyzed the development of moral insight in the south that even the churches swung to the support of this evil. Southern nationalism was enlisted to regard it as its typical institution. To acquire more land for growing cotton and tobacco and to increase the representation of the South in Congress, southerners went into Texas and stirred up a movement for its independence from Mexico, which was precipitately acknowledged by us. Border frictions with that nation were then blown up into a war in which we grabbed what now forms the entire western half of the United States. But before you condemn us morally, remember that this sort of thing was done by every nation in those days, if it was strong enough, including the nations of Asia. Better than moral condemnation of others is sociological and psychological understanding. Thru these there may be hopes of ethical advance such as the moralizing past failed to produce.

While the profit-motive worked to stultify the advance of humanistic feeling in the cotton and tobacco growing south, humanism advanced in the north, whipped up especially by the novel, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Nominally, our Civil War was over the right claimed by the southern states to secede from the Union; but slavery was the underlying issue. Our President Lincoln saw he could gain a military advantage by declaring the slaves free.

Had he not been assassinated by a fanatic, Lincoln might have moderated the way in which the victorious North dealt with the conquered South. Ideology might have been tempered by a realistic concession to local cultural facts. Conceivably, he might even have mollified the ruined slave owners with some financial compensation, helped the region

start its economic recovery, and insisted that the liberated slaves be given good schooling and be trained in agriculture and in democratic procedures before they were allowed to vote. The passions loosed by war, however, and the greed of "carpet bag" politicians to court the ignorant negro vote, killed any hope of such wise measures.

The reaction of white southerners was not other than a competent psychologist would have predicated. Vengeful sentiments against their conquerors, and wounded narcissism were sure to be the ruling motives. Their defeat and ruin determined them to find a way of thwarting the changed social order imposed on them by northern force. Impotent to act openly, they formed secret societies like the Klu Klux Klan to frighten the negroes away from the polls. Forced to give freedom to their former slaves, they could still find ways of denying them the education, opportunities of professional employment and areas of housing which would raise their self-respect. They could no more be forced to receive them as friends in their homes than the Indian Government can force old-fashioned Brahmins to receive outcasts.

Other sociological factors will help explain why the Jews, the Roman Catholics, and many newly arrived groups of foreigners are also given low social status in some states of our Union. But I prefer to turn to a psychological factor which underlies all brands of ethnocentric snobbery, everywhere.

It is that a large section of people in a competitive culture fail to achieve the attributes which they have been taught to regard as marks of respectability. They have not become wealthy or distinguished; have not been too successful in marriage; are not wholly proud of the way they have raised their children; are not greatly loved nor esteemed; have their share of vices, and secretly know that they are somewhat mean and cowardly. Now, it is very painful

to admit these things, and we seek to escape from having to recognize the facts. Some people try to do so by the road of alcohol.

Another way, however, is by scapegoating, variation of which is to pretend that, after all, other people are just as bad, so that we gain by comparison. This demeaning of our neighbors we have seen active in scandal-mongering.

When everything else fails, there is one thing the inferior man can always fall back on. He can say "I may be a drunkard and a thief and generally no good but, as compared to these other fellows, at least I am a member of the dominant ethnic group ! At least my skin is of the approved color !"

The lie motivated by hate has received its most monstrous development in the political and international field. American commercial propaganda methods were taken over by the Russian Communists for political purposes. Adolf Hitler, who frankly sanctioned "the whopping lie" in his *Mein Kampf*, took over from the Communists in order to whip up hatred of the Communists themselves, of the Jews, and later of each nation as it entered the war against him. He developed the lie-of-hate to unprecedented and monstrous heights.

Since Hitler, the lie motivated by, and intended to stir up, hate, has become a formidable weapon in international affairs. Its unscrupulous use by especially a northern great power, and by others whom she schools in her ideology, threatens the world with a new kind of slavery.

As great an approach to democratic government as cultural conditions will permit is desirable. This is not because "the voice of the people is the voice of God", for frequently they are quite stupid. The important reasons for democracy are that (i) unless you give the people the feeling that they have been consulted in public affairs you are unlikely to get much cooperation from them (ii) unless

people have the vote they can ill protect themselves against exploitation. However, democratic rights are precarious in the hands of people who have no democratic tradition or who are so desperately poor that food seems to them more important than freedom.

Another factor in suiting a people to be self-governing is the family structure. In a polygamous family, the children grow up to expect autocratic domination of the master over his wives and concubines and their children; hence polygamous countries are usually autocratic. Anthropological studies made during the last war, by Ruth Benedict of imperial Japan and by others of Nazi Germany, showed that in both these nations the home pattern was one of autocratic male domination.

Studies of the type of politician who manages to raise himself to dictatorial power have also been enlightening. The typical dictator is of the paranoiac mentality. The paranoid builds a picture of the world which is insane yet follows with absolute logicity if you grant the premises from which he starts; his plausibility and absolute sincerity make him very convincing when he presents his crazy schemes.

In a study which the present speaker made of the personalities of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin, their case-histories were seen to have several points in common. Each had a gentle mother whom he loved. Each had a brutal father who used to beat up that mother and the child, so that each hated the father and all the "respectable" things the father stood for. Hate therefore became the driving emotion of all the three men.

Nazism and Fascism are now reduced to dormancy, but not yet Communism. It has unquestionably the power to vitalize its followers to the performance of astonishing feats of self-dedicated devotion, courage, self-sacrifice and energy. It breaks with the past and prides itself on its

modernity. It makes use of every device of science and has performed wonders in large areas of Russia and China in building gigantic works of irrigation, electrifying the villages, and developing great industries.

It has even great heroes and saints whom it can propose for not only the admiration but the love of the people. I remember how in 1932, when a party of psychologists whom I had organized to visit Russia were entering the tomb of Lenin, our woman guide remained outside. This was because, as she told us, the sight of his remains always brought back to her the last time she had seen and heard him alive, and then she would break down in tears. I have no sympathy with those who, ostrich like, refuse to look at both sides of Communism. If nothing could be found in its favor, it would not present the danger that it does. There are, however, two sides to the coin.

First of all—and in order to be in the greatest possible degree politically non-controversial, I will use the qualifying phrase “rightly or wrongly”—the impression is general throughout the world that American reporting of events and conditions generally tries to be fair and truthful, whereas Communist reporting subordinates truth to propaganda purposes. This impression is enormously damaging to the communist cause.

We are concerned here, of course, with the psychological aspects of the matter, and I will try to keep political, economic, and moral considerations as such out of the discussion; but it will be impossible to rule out current *opinions* about these facts insofar as they become the basis on which attitudes are taken.

Thus, one of the gravest concerns of the world today is the maintenance of peace. It is generally recognized that when World War III occurs, the Communist powers are strong enough to obliterate the civilization of North America, which is powerful enough at the same time to obliterate the

civilizations of Russia and China, so that what with submarines popping up off their coasts to atom-bomb any surviving cities, war for these countries means suicide. It is also generally seen that no nation in the northern hemisphere could escape becoming embroiled in the war.

Consequently both Communist and anti-Communist blocs endeavor to win men's minds over to the view that their own policy will lead to peace while that of the opposed faction will lead to war.

In this psychological warfare, the Russians, as usual, have succeeded in keeping the initiative by a series of proposals that both sides should cease to test atom bombs, or should make other agreements towards disarmament, and this has won them many friends. The Americans, however, know that as they cannot match the Communists in man-power, their sole chance of "winning" a war depends on maintaining a superiority in quality of weapons. Additionally, Americans suspect (we do not need to enter into the question of how justly) that while we would feel in honor bound to keep our agreement, the Communists would find ways of evading it and so become a power dominating the world. We have, therefore, insisted on the establishment of a thoroughly dependable system of mutual inspection teams on each others' territory before we will enter on an agreement. This, however, the Communist government cannot accept because it would destroy the secrecy which they consider vital to their entire system. So we remain deadlocked until the new Earth-satellites which will bring home minute photographs of any area of the world makes secrecy anywhere impossible.

More damaging to the Communist claim to be the party of peace is, however, the fact that wherever in the world violence is brewing, as at present in the Congo and in Laos, instead of backing up the United Nations' efforts to maintain order and lawful government and reach a just settle-

ment, they do their utmost to keep strife alive, to supply arms to the factious elements, and to tie the hands of the United Nations. This raises in many neutral breasts the fear that they may be instrumental in fanning one of these small fires into the dreaded universal holocaust.

It was as an economic revolution that Communism first started. It made a sacred book of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, which is largely an exposition of the very real inequities of the beginning of the capitalist era in industrial England. Although modern capitalism is extremely different from that of Marx's time, this book and others in the same tenor still make very good propaganda wherever in the world there is destitution, and the figure of the exploiting capitalist makes an excellent scape-goat on whom to load the sins of landlords, zemindars or merely poor industrial organization.

Personally, I think that in the long run Communism would have come out not too badly if it had contented itself with an honest exposée of evil conditions wherever found and set up for comparison examples of democratic public ownership and management. They have preferred, however, to present such dark pictures of the free societies and such roseate pictures of things under Communism as discredit them in a world where the actual facts have a way of leaking out.

They also have set up a propaganda barrage which refers to the Americans as "imperialist war-mongers". This effort has aimed to capitalize on the remembrance which most Asiatic nations have of a period of subjection to some European power such as England or France and the fact that Americans are descended from British and other European stock—omitting, of course, all reference to the fact that we resemble you in having rebelled against British rule. This particular propaganda effort, however, is too obviously intended to blind people to the fact that Russia, having

swallowed up Esthonia, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, part of Austria and other free nations might herself appear to be the world's greatest imperialist power. Add that China has recently swallowed Tibet and is pushing her way into other Asian territory, and this propaganda about imperialism has tended to backfire to the Communists' disadvantage.

All the above factors seem to me to help explain why the recent successes of Communism have tended to be only of the military order and why its successes of subversion have been bogging down. Add to this that from the countries which have been subjected to a Communist regime for a few years there pours out an unceasing stream of refugees. These declare that they paid for any benefits it offered an unendurably high price.

From the fact that people moralize so much against the wickedness of war, and yet do so little to federate the nations under world law (with powers limited to those needed to maintain peace) it has long been clear to psychologists that part of our nature craves conflict.

William James listed those of war's satisfactions which are on a conscious plane, such as its excitement, its call to adventure, its appeal to the heroic in us, and tried to devise alternate satisfactions. These included drafting all young men for a year's service to the community, polar exploration, and international games. Subsequent explorations at greater depth, however, have revealed motivations more difficult to deal with. I will list a few of them.

Sadism is one. There is in us a macabre lust to cause suffering. In war we can satisfy this against enemy victims and earn the approval instead of the usual disapproval of our fellows.

Masochism is another. In war we macerate ourselves for the beloved country.

The oedipus complex is another. Love for our father and the piety we have been taught will not let us pay back "the old man" for the many times he has given us a licking or frustrated us. But enemy soldiers are good father surrogates whom we are welcome to shoot. The enemy's "fatherland" is indeed a figure to whom it is easy to point as "violating" our "mother country".

Then there is also, in marching and living with an army of other men, satisfaction for our homosexuality. All feeling of hostility, on the other hand, now finds an approved object in the enemy, so that for everyone at home we experience only a universal friendliness.

Heterosexual desires are, of course, gratified by the adulation, if not the easy physical favors, which the girls give their heroic boys.

Finally, conscience itself, which usually condemns all acts of hate, now approves of hatred so long as it is centered on the foe. It also urges us to feel the bliss of offering up everything, even life itself, on the altar of patriotism.

All these factors go to make man so warlike a creature that he has never been held back long from fighting except by a policing power. J. C. Flugel has pointed out that our feeble support of the United Nations is due to the difficulty of transferring our loyalty from the nation as parent-surrogate, to the U. N.

Flugel suggests that it will become easier to make this transfer as we come to look to the United Nations as in every sense our father; as not only our protector against violence but our refuge and source of security economically. Certainly unless we solve this problem of apathy to a peace-enforcing agency, we shall not live to solve many others.

III

MOSTLY MARKETING AND MARRIAGE

I HAVE still a few remarks to make about propaganda and honesty and the deferred topic of the profit-motive. The Anglo-Saxon peoples have always prided themselves on their truthfulness. No figures exist which justify comparisons, but at least two tests seem to show that in my own country this virtue is less robust than is claimed. First, when one of our magazines, the *Readers Digest*, sent two ladies in a but slightly damaged car to various garages to have it repaired, and when they took television sets similarly to repair shops, the majority of garages and repairmen over the country made false claims about what needed to be done. Second, in the recent scandal about "payola" in which it was revealed that a young college professor in collaboration with broadcasting companies had flagrantly deceived the public, the number of people who condoned his lies as long as he was able "to get away with it" was shocking.

Less flagrantly deceptive, far more subtle, but on that account extremely dangerous are some of the newer trends in advertising. The older forms sometimes misrepresented products, but this could to some extent be reduced by such legislation as the Food and Drugs Act. This put out of business many patent medicines and stopped the mislabeling of many products.

I must quote to you in this connection an amusing suggestion put forward by some newspaper in London that advertisements should be taxed according to the grossness of their claims for their product. Thus "Buy Boots' Beer" would be but lightly taxed. "Boots Beer is Best" would come in for something heavier; while "Boots Beer Builds

Burly Britons" would have to pay really heavily.

One of the new suggestions for advertising is that it take advantage of the facts that a visual impression which is too faint or too quick to cross the "limen" into consciousness nevertheless leaves its impress on the foreconscious, and especially if it be frequently repeated. Thus, the name of Boots Beer could be flashed onto the radio screen so quickly that none of the audience would notice it, and yet when they came to buy their beer, this brand would be preferred. If the same means were used for political as well as commercial propaganda, this would gravely imperil democracy. Fortunately, tests of this device have not been so consistently positive that it has yet come into use.

Very different has been the success of applying "motivational research" or "depth psychology", to replace the more simple forms of consumer-research. The new approach is carried on by psycho-analytically oriented psychologists employed by some of our big advertising agencies. The older consumers' research was content with simply asking prospective buyers such questions as "What features do you look for when you buy a car?" The questionee would answer in the terms which he could consciously acknowledge to himself, the terms which made him appear to be rational and shrewd, such as "I look for low first cost and good mileage, reliability, decent appearance, and comfort." Actually, however, manufacturers saw that people were not buying the type of car embodying these qualities.

The motivation analysts found that people come to associate particular personality-building qualities with particular cars, and that the advertising of a particular car must be along the lines which will appeal to the group whose personality-needs that car could satisfy. For instance, according to a mid-western agency one of the reasons for buying a big shiny new car every couple of years is that doing so gives the buyer a sense of power and masculinity.

Such advertising may seem only to waste wealth on vanities, but in other cases it may make people buy products injurious to their health or it may be pointed deliberately at breaking down their moral standards if these are seen to interfere with some advertiser's profits.

Individuals as well as the community are better off without alcoholic beverages. But a motivation research firm used the discovery that many persons related wine to festive occasions in their childhood, to induce the Morgan David wine people to tie the "home and mother" theme into advertising. The result was that they sold millions of dollars' more wine. The astute use of such facts as that the phallic symbolism of a cigar helps little men feel big largely accounted for boosting cigar-sales to a height of 6,000,000,000 in 1955.

So much for the motives which we must recognize and struggle against in order to socialize speech along the line of truthfulness, and to socialize the cruel and greedy impulses within the human heart.

Having got these matters off my chest, I now am free to discuss with you one of the most vexed questions in our modern life—how can the sex impulses of men and women best be socialized in such a way as to bring not merely momentary pleasure to the individual but maximum benefit to him, his partner, his children and society. There are many aspects of this problem and they will have to be treated separately. Let us begin with the cruder ones and work towards the more subtle.

The biological "end" of the sex drive may be said to be the production of viable offspring. Other things being equal, a species, or a family stirps which produces more offspring living till they themselves reproduce than does any other species or stirps, will populate and inherit the earth. Among primitive peoples living where there is plenty of land, the rule still holds. Floods, famine, disease and war keep the

expectation of life down to a few years and so a high birth-rate is necessary unless the people are to die out or their land be taken from them by neighbors who multiply faster.

Moreover, in such primitive societies it is hard to make provision for one's old age. There are no company shares, bonds, or insurance which the poor peasant can safely invest in. So it is prudent to breed enough children so that even if half of them die there still will be some to give one a home in one's old age. And in the case of a feud with a powerful neighbor, one wants plenty of strong sons at one's elbow.

Tradition, consequently, is always on the side of fecundity. Religion generally supports tradition with supernatural sanctions, sometimes making any interference with fecundity a sin. We see this exhibited most strongly at the moment by the Roman Catholic Church, although even it is now backing down somewhat and explaining that all it opposes in birth control is the use of effective scientific methods which, it says, thwart an assumed purpose behind the natural instinct.

This traditional and ecclesiastic attitude was justifiable 2,000 years ago when it was formulated. Since then, certain changes have come in, however, of which they have not taken account, changes both in our private lives and in world conditions.

Privately, savings are now safer from brigandage than they were, and a host of opportunities exist for profitable investment and insurance (partly compulsory) which secure old age and illness better than does reliance on the piety of children, who more and more tend to leave home and to begrudge their filial responsibilities. Moreover, it has become much harder to care for a swarm of children now—with the one family, one apartment pattern—than it was when the large family of elders, young marrieds and children all

shared a big house or compound and there was always grandma to baby-sit. Also, the modern woman is not content to be a mere kitchen drudge and breeding animal but aspires towards individuated personality with a life reaching beyond the home to clubs, recreations, social work and playing a part in the life around her.

The children, too, will be more stimulated in having such a mother, as one whom they can respect intellectually. They are better for being a family just big enough for companionship rather than an unkempt horde quarrelling around the knees of a mother physically present but too exhausted by child bearing and chores to play with them.

Finally, there is a certain optimum population for every country at a given stage of its technical development. This depends chiefly on the amount of food it can produce or exchange other products for. A country can slowly increase its ability to feed more people by extending its agriculture to areas which now lack water or are frozen most of the year or are economically too far from markets. To do this though takes time and the investment of much capital which must be found. In the meantime, if the population is booming ahead, new mouths may eat up all the capital that was intended to improve conditions. This is approximately what has happened to India under her first and second five-year plans.

In ancient times, the solution of the dilemma was found by invading another country and stealing its land. So overpopulation creates first hunger and poverty, and then war. The excessive populations of Germany, Italy and Japan were frankly admitted as a reason by these countries for launching World Wars I and II. I predict that in a decade or so it will cause China to invade Mongolia or Siberia. Atomic war, however, is almost as destructive to the victors as to the vanquished. Hence it is imperative that we do everything to postpone it, including reduction in the size of families.

Besides social difficulties in the way of doing this, such as a country's poverty, dearth of doctors and midwives to staff clinics and lack of the degree of literacy needed in order to whip up a campaign as Japan has done, there are psychological obstacles. I have spoken of the heavy weight of tradition—"It is impious to depart from the ways of our parents". J. C. Flugel, especially, has pointed to factors that are deeper-lying.

Thus, man sees in his children a kind of immortality for himself. "This my body must decay; but these young bodies begotten by me and in my image will carry on, perpetuating my life generation after generation. Moreover, the great deeds which I aspired to do but failed, they will do in the years to come".

Again, the child is seen as a kind of phallus. He or she is a tangible proof of my virility. Those who know the phallic symbolism of an arrow will recognise this motive in the ancient tribute to a father of many sons: "He hath his quiver full of them".

But why do we hear so frequently—especially from the Catholics—the argument "Modern contraceptive techniques are against Nature"? Surely airplanes, surgery, and many things in modern living are against Nature in the same degree? No, explains the Catholic, for neither they, nor voluntary chastity, frustrate the *purpose* of a natural instinct in action. With the metaphysics of assuming that behind an instinctive act, there exists the "purpose" of an entity called Nature, and that we are in a position to know and under an obligation to respect the "purposes" of this assumed entity, it is not my province here to deal. What seems more fruitful is to note that "she" is identified in our unconscious minds with our mothers. The regularity with which "she" is referred to as "her" and openly as "Mother Nature", and the importance in all the world's mythologies of a female nature-goddess, be she Hera, Deme-

ter, Maha Devi, or any of a hundred others, would seem to prove the point. In our unconscious thinking, therefore, it is the purposes of our mother which we frustrate by our birth-control. And of course when it came to our actual parent planning for another child, we know that many of us as children did jealously wish we could frustrate this threat to our share of her love.

Still another motive against birth-control is the narcissistic one. A child will more or less duplicate ourselves. "How can the world have too many of such wonderful creatures as myself?"

I pass now to *institutions* to which the sex-drive and the need of socializing it have given origin.

Among the lower animals, those of a gregarious character are usually but not always polygamous. More often it is among non-gregarious species that we find families of a male, a female and their immature young, which may be replaced by new partners annually when the young leave home or may entail life-long monogamy. The higher species are those which afford the longest protection and training to the young by both parents, a condition best satisfied by monogamous mating. This also fosters the development of affection.

Under the somewhat misleading title of *The Sexual and Social Life of the Apes and Monkeys*—because no apes were involved—Zimmerman has published an account of observations he made some years ago at the London Zoo on baboons. He found that though the sexes were about equal in numbers, their social unit was the horde consisting of a potent old patriarch, his harem comprising all the attractive females, and an excluded outer circle of unsatisfied bachelors. A bachelor sometimes lured a zenana lady into a corner. The patriarch, especially if he were growing old, might wink at this up to a point. If the affair went too far, though, he attacked the bachelor.

Then a curious thing happened. The fight became a free-for-all over the loose female, in which some males sided with the bachelor and some with the old man, switching sides frequently. The smoke of battle clearing always revealed the dead body of the frivolous female—"the woman always pays"—and the patriarch either again dominant or replaced by a new lord of the harem.

This study lends support to the theory of Robertson Smith that the earliest men lived in such hordes—the theory which Freud has been criticised for adopting in his *Totem and Taboo*. Actually it proves nothing conclusively even were the baboons related to man as closely as are the apes.

The apes, who are tail-less and often walk erect like us, comprise the fierce massive gorillas, the tall intelligent chimpanzees, the humorous pot-bellied orang-utans, and those gymnasts—the gibbons. A number of studies have been made of these, in captivity and in the wild, but with inconclusive results as regards their natural sex-life. In captivity, they are all inconstant; but in the wild, there is much evidence to show that the gibbons and, perhaps, the chimps are monogamists. Unfortunately *homo sapiens* is not in direct line of descent from any of them, and if he were it would establish only a vague probability that his mating-instinct was the same.

So we must leave the zoologists for the anthropologists.

No human groups have yet been found so primitive as not to have a well-developed language and a culture. Therefore, anthropologists confess ignorance as to what form of family was the very earliest and corresponded to instinct unmodified by culture. The savage societies which have been studied offer examples of a great variety of relationships as Malinovsky, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead especially have shown in their various studies.

Malinovsky, for instance, describes Australian aborigines who actually encourage small children to attempt coitus

for the entertainment of onlookers. Polynesians are permissive to both sexes before marriage unless the girl be a princess. Many tribes have a custom of group marriage whereby a man may have intercourse with the wife of any of his brothers, or a woman with the husband of any of her sisters. A number of quite advanced societies such as the ancient Jews, the Muslims, and the Mormons have upheld polygamy and in isolated parts of Burma and Tibet where women are scarce a woman may have several husbands. Among the Esquimaux, when a man must make an arduous journey which would be too severe for his ageing wife, it is considered quite proper for him to borrow for the duration of the trip the strong young wife of a friend. Among the Kwakiutl tribe of the northwest Pacific coast, writes Margaret Mead, the groom takes his bride to his home village in order to see her treated outrageously by his relatives, after which she takes him to her village to be insulted and abused by hers.

Only one thing one does not find among savage peoples—post-marital promiscuity. With all their strange variations on the marital theme, there are always rituals and rules which must be followed, and one of them is post-marital fidelity on the part of at least the wife. The reason is obvious. Adultery leads to jealousies and quarrels, often resulting in killings. Moreover, the resulting strains in the home tear the children to pieces emotionally.

An infant's first attachment is invariably to its mother, because it is she who feeds it, gives it warm contact with her body, and comforts it in all its wants and pains.

In the case of the girl, some of this attachment becomes transferred to others, but at first, chiefly to persons of her own sex. This is the homo-sexual stage. It is quite normal for the girl at this time to have "crushes" on woman teachers, to whom she brings flowers and candy and whom she regards as very wonderful.

In time, however, love for her father normally grows stronger than that for her mother—the hetero-sexual phase has opened. Boys now also become at first tolerable, then interesting, then the most important things in life. One of them in particular captures her love and maybe her hand in marriage.

The boy begins in the same way by loving his mother best. He may turn away from her somewhat earlier than his sister does, to hero-worship their father, of whose strength and ability he will be heard boasting. A male teacher or likelier a scout-master may influence him strongly in this homo-sexual period; but his most important associations are with other boys. However, the boy then presently swings back again to his first love, his mother, and tolerates and then courts feminine society. He has his affairs of the heart and finally he marries.

Now, there are some young men and rather more young women who do not complete this development but remain fixated, in greater or lesser degree, at the homo-sexual stage. The principal reasons for this are that the oppositely sexed parent rejected their early overtures of affection; or, if their parents were not happily married, the parent of same sex as themselves may, out of loneliness, have lavished an excess of physically tinged love on them. So now they find erotic pleasure in embracing members of their own sex. They are labelled homo-sexual *perverts*.

Wherever many adults of one sex are herded together, particularly in prisons but also in armies, navies and even monasteries and boarding schools, a certain amount of homo-sexuality springs up because of the deprivation of more normal relationships.

In certain societies, such as the ancient Greeks or the Massai, especially among the military, homo-sexuality has been approved. Among most cultured peoples today, however, it is condemned and becomes a ground for shame,

so that it has to be expressed in sublimated forms. Among such forms are the love of humanity at large, or the soldier's service of his king or president and fatherland. But its existence makes it hard for the individual to attain a successful marriage with all the dependent joys of home and children.

A marriage is likely to be a happy one only if the respective partners are able to be individually happy.

Terman, Popenoe and other investigators have found that the most important thing to note regarding a prospective wife or husband is the home atmosphere he or she comes from, because this will tend to be reproduced. Were the relations between the parents, and between them and the children, affectionate, or was there much bickering? Especially, did this girl love her father and did this young man cherish and protect his mother?

While of course desperate poverty may wreck a marriage, yet the amount of money the couple have to spend has been found to be relatively unimportant to marital happiness—much less than disagreement on what portion is to be spent on his pleasures and what proportion on hers. More vital also is the question of how the money is earned. Not only may the breadwinner drive himself so hard as to have little time for wife and children, but certain vocations are associated with a low, others with a high, divorce rate. In America, engineers, clergymen and professional people have the lowest divorce rate, while actors, travelling salesmen and casual laborers have the highest.

Several years ago, Dr. Paul Popenoe started classes in the psychology of marriage relations. He has, in Los Angeles, an institute for training people as professional marriage counselors. In many of our universities, such courses now are given. Those who as college or high-school students took one of these courses average much lower in percentage of divorces to marriages than the average of people generally.

The great test of a marriage is whether one has raised one's children to be happy and useful citizens. For to have accomplished this almost assumes that one has not altogether failed in one's other marital obligations.

The first duty of a prospective parent is to see that his children have a good hereditary endowment. If one has a serious inheritable defect, it is not right to beget children, nor will they thank one for bringing them into the world handicapped at the outset. Everyone should be familiar with the characteristics of his own ancestors and those of his intended mate and not go thru with the marriage if either stock is mal-formed or sickly in body or is dull in mind or predisposed to mental disorder. Narcissism however, prevents us from rating critically our own qualities; and romantic love from assessing those of a sweetheart.

Another "must" before the child is conceived is that both parents really want him and want also one or more little brothers and sisters so that he will not be handicapped by being an only child.

The child, that started aright by coming into the world well-born and well-wanted, is only biologically a human being but psychologically is a mere animal, greedy, filth-loving, sensual, passionate and completely self-centered. He must be socialized into a human being. But he is also an intelligent, sensitive, responsive little flower capable of idealism and love; and we shall ruin these possibilities if we go about "moulding him" into our preconceptions of what we wish him to be. If a gardener tends a rose bush according to the needs of rose bushes he will get something beautiful but if he is determined to treat it as an orchid or a lotus he will fall short of anything.

Father and mother must concert their efforts so that the child is not confused. They must put their emphasis on encouraging each positive manifestation. This has been found to be much more effective in training a child than

fixating his attention on his faults thru lecturing, scolding and punishing. The author of the injunction "spare the rod and spoil the child" had but little appreciation of child nature. Yet a firmness which is not harshness is absolutely necessary, too, and a child's overrunning the rights of others is absolutely not to be tolerated.

Now a few words as to the special psychological role of the mother, after which I will speak of the role of the father.

Very interesting experiments have been performed recently with baby apes. It was found that they are frightened by the intrusion into their cage of imitation snakes and of various bizarre constructions pulled across the floor. (I have myself observed that Ceylonese devil-masks frightened my pet gibbons). If in the cage there was placed a crude model of wire complete with breasts of an anthropoid female with milk-bottles inside and especially if there was another model covered with cloth, the baby ape fled to the breast of one of the models and, clinging there, felt no further anxiety.

The practice of many maternity homes, of removing an infant from its mother immediately after birth and keeping it in a sterilized, separate room except at feeding time is now being abandoned as psychologically injurious. For a like reason, children's hospitals now encourage the parents, and especially the mother, to bring the child and be with it as much as possible during and after an operation or while it is in hospital, to allay its anxiety.

The results of depriving a child, at various ages, of its mother, were investigated statistically by Bowlby, working for UNESCO. He examined several thousand cases of war orphans throughout Europe. Depending on how soon after birth the mother-deprivation took place, the children grew up incapable of normal affection and suspicious, like a wild animal, of any friendly approach. If an affectionate foster-mother had been found soon enough after the de-

privation, the damage was mitigated—but not if this woman was but temporary and replaced by others or if she had to divide her attention between too many children. For this reason children who have been brought up in an orphanage remain at a disadvantage compared with those who have their own homes. And in a normal home, the mother's role cannot even be relegated predominantly to a nurse without injury to the child, who needs continuous attachment to a single maternal figure.

The early problems of child-rearing may seem physical, but all involve psychological factors.

Not always is the situation within the mother's control. Thus, she may be unable to supply enough milk from her breasts and have to supplement it from a bottle or stop breast feeding prematurely. This must be done with great gentleness to keep to a minimum the sense of frustration and development of a deprivation-complex.

At a later stage, the child will be introduced to other foods. If, however, he is forced to eat what his mother decides is good for him, this may develop an antagonism to these foods and a craving for such as are forbidden.

Then comes the all-important matter of toilet-training. Forgetting that the baby is still a little animal who has yet to acquire attitudes of shame, cleanliness, etc.,—the mother is impatient to regulate his habits and make him clean as soon as possible. The baby resenting this as intrusive interference in what it considers peculiarly its private affair, a struggle results which leaves lasting imprints on his character. Freud found that the struggle with the mother begets irritability, the habitual holding back of bowel contents begets parsimony and tidiness.

As the children grow up, the mother is the chief influence in making the home a refuge where one can always find love and understanding. But she should not delegate all

the disciplinary problems to the father, making him appear an ogre in the children's eyes.

To her daughters, she is the model of womanly qualities and the example of how one brings up children, how one manages the family expenses within a budget, and how one gets along with a husband.

To her sons, she shows what qualities—affection, companionship, etc. they should look for in a wife, and what one is like.

The father's role is, for all the children, only second in importance to that of the mother. It is thru him chiefly that they come to know the great world of political and industrial life outside the home. His contacts are broader because, in present-day society, he usually is the breadwinner.

The male usually is the larger, stronger and more athletic member of the family. It is for him, therefore, to develop in the children a love for the outdoors and for strenuous exertion by playing games with them, taking them occasionally to see sports events, and planning outings.

To his daughters, he presents the picture of what a man is like and what the qualities are which they should look for (or avoid) in their future husbands.

To his sons, he is the model for such masculine qualities as physical and moral courage, honesty, strength, efficiency, and intelligence. He has them see him at his work, meet other men, and talk about their future careers. He demonstrates how they can become inspiring fathers in their own turn, and how to make a woman happy thru loyalty and considerateness.

Next to the influence of parents on their children will be that of their companions. Now, we cannot *force* our children to admire the companions we would prefer for them or shun altogether those who are vicious; and from economic considerations it may be hard for us to live in a neighbor-

hood of good families. Our best bet is to show our children that they may safely confide in us and discuss with us their problems and their friends. This is not an easy thing to do but the only safe way.

Then comes the problem of their schools and particularly of the teachers under whose influence they will come. It is important that these should be technically well qualified. More important is it that they have the capacity to lead students to a real interest in their subjects of study and not cause them to swear that once they have passed the examination they will never look at the subject again. Most important of all is that the teacher be an emotionally normal human being, without unconscious complexes which he can only work off at the expense of his students.

IV

THE INTERPLAY OF PERSONALITY WITH PHYSIQUE AND THE ESTHETIC

OUR FIRST lecture was about how the individual learns to orientate himself in his world. The next two saw him adapting himself to the standards of that world by becoming socialized, sometimes to the cost of his individuality. Therefore, in the present and in the next, our final lecture, I intend to speak of influences which strengthen, and of means whereby we may cultivate, our personality.

From ancient times there has come down a suspicion that personality was related to body-type. If you have read Homer's *Odyssey*, you will remember that when the enchantress Calypso waved her wand over the members of Odysseus' crew who had partaken of her banquet, they assumed the shapes of the animals whom they resembled in character—whether a pig, a dog, a wolf, etc.

Some very old books show pictures of human faces from which they try to teach the reader to distinguish the leonine, the foxy, the piggish and other types.

Lavater and other physiognomists associated traits of character with particular facial features. The person with a receding chin was a moral weakling, the one with large nose was aggressive, the thick-lipped person was sensual, the very hairy man was virile, etc.

The most noted adherent of this school was the Italian criminologist Lombroso. According to him, you needed hardly more than look at an accused man to know whether or not he was a criminal. There was a definite "criminal type", characterized by low, sloping, narrow forehead, bushy eyebrows, receding chin, prominent cheek-bones, and large ears.

The physiognomists supported their theories by numerous photographs of individuals whose traits ran true to theory. Unfortunately, their sampling was not random and only "hits" and not "misses" were taken into account.

The phrenologists enjoyed an even greater pseudo-scientific vogue than the physiognomists. They came in when the discovery was made that certain mental or nervous functions are associated with specific areas of the brain. True, there is a prominent fissure, the Fissure of Rolando, at approximately the middle of each side of the cortex. Areas on the dorsal or hinder side of this fissure are connected with the capacity to feel sensations—those from the lower extremities being carried to the top of the rear side of the fissure and those from the face, to the bottom of it. Areas on the ventral or forward side of the fissure are connected with motor functions in a corresponding way, so that damage to an area means paralysis of the corresponding muscles. Visual, auditory, speech and writing centers have also been located.

Particularly prominent in the investigation of brain areas were two English surgeons, Gall and Spurzheim. This was in the heyday of the "faculty" psychology. Carried away by enthusiasm, they gave to almost every part of the cortex the name of some "faculty" which seemed to them appropriate. They were guided by such gratuitous assumptions as that, since the eye is the organ of sight and the ear the organ of hearing, the "faculties" of sight and hearing would necessarily be located over the eyes and ears respectively. Since piety is the "highest" faculty, it would be located at the very top of the cranium.

Gall proceeded to "prove" his claims by a remarkable technique. Hypnotism was coming into respectability, though its laws and those of suggestion were little understood. Gall would hypnotize a man on a stage in front of an audience and then remark to these "When I press my thumb

on the area of this man's head which corresponds to a particular faculty, you will see him behave in a way appropriate to that faculty. For instance, I now press on his organ of veneration." No precaution was taken to prevent the hypnotic subject overhearing the remark ; so of course he at once flopped down on his knees and folded his hands in prayer.

When I was a boy, phrenology was quite generally accepted as a science. A spate of practitioners all over the land reaped profits from "reading character" by its aid, and their charts and plaster casts of heads, with the location of "faculties" indicated all over them, were a common sight.

Unfortunately, phrenology rested on several assumptions all of which we now know to be false. First, it assumed a degree of knowledge of the brain beyond what exists even today. Secondly, it assumed that greater development in any mental function would necessarily be accompanied by a detectable increase in the size of the corresponding area. Thirdly, it assumed that protuberances in the brain cortex could be measured by the shape of the outside of the skull, taking no account of the fact that the skull everywhere varies in thickness. The final and the most faulty false assumption was, that mental "faculties", in the sense of abilities which can be applied in no matter what field, exist at all. Thorndike and Woodworth long ago proved that improvement in mathematical reasoning hardly carried over to reasoning about practical affairs, and it had been shown by William James as early as 1890 that improvement in memorizing Victor Hugo's poetry hardly carried over even to memorizing another kind of poetry (Milton's). Whether elements in common between the tasks are present is the important point. Experiments by Gilboit, Fracker, Fudd and Orata have, though, led to a more modified view.

In Germany, in the meantime, from a psychiatric approach, Kretschmer was compiling a classification of mental disorders which led him to study their relationship to three types of body. In the energetic, large-boned "athletic" type he found most frequently a paranoid trend. The *pyknics*, with rotund bodies, inclined to hysteria. The tall, small-boned *leptosomes* were likeliest to develop schizophrenia.

Much the same conclusions were reached, a few years ago by Sheldon, after careful measurement of many thousands of individuals. According to his theory, there are three physical types of humans based on the relative development of the three layers of cells in the blastula. If the development of the mesoderm, from which must come the cardiovascular system and striped muscles predominates we get the athletic type of person whom he calls a *mesomorph*. If the development of the in-folded middle layer of cells, the endoderm, leads, we get the person with superior digestive organs and inclining to fleshiness whom he calls *endomorph*. If the outside, ectoplasmic, layer from which the skin and nervous system originate develops fastest we get what he calls an *ectomorph*.

The mesomorphs, forceful and physically active, predominated, Sheldon found, among the paranoically inclined. The endomorphs, jolly and sociable, were most frequent among the hysterics. The ectomorphs, the most nervous and intelligent of the lot, were found mostly among the schizophrenics.

Another element in character which the ancients remarked and accounted for by a physical theory is, temperament. Hypocrates, "the father of medicine", adopted the current view that the temperaments were four in number—the sanguine, the phlegmatic, the melancholic and the choleric. Each was caused by an excess of one of the "body-fluids"—blood, phlegm, yellow bile or black bile.

Modern psychology rejects this view and is content merely to describe the temperaments, if it accepts them at all, in terms of the speed and power with which an individual reacts to situations. According to this description, the choleric man is one who reacts strongly and quickly ; the sanguine, strongly but more slowly ; the phlegmatic, weakly though quickly ; and the melancholic, weakly and slowly.

Others would build an explanation on a basis of glandular functioning. A choleric reaction is rather clearly related to generous secretion of adrenalin, and the amount probably diminishes as we go down the scale—Berman described a masculine type caused by over activity of the anterior lobe of the pituitary gland and a feminine type due to over activity of the posterior lobe. More than that, however is guesswork.

The glands, however, and our dispositions and moods are strongly related, even if as yet it is not possible to tell by the amount of adrenalin in the blood whether the individual is angry or frightened. The usefulness of adrenalin is that it gives the blood the excess sugar it needs for either combat or flight, causes the blood to coagulate quickly if wounds are inflicted, and so constricts the blood vessels of the inner organs as to flush with blood the muscles needed in flight or combat.

Sherrington in England, and Cannon in America, showed by X-rays of the intestine of a cat which had been given a meal containing bismuth that all peristaltic action ceased when a dog barked at her, and was resumed only slowly. Chronic mental irritation in a man, owing perhaps to business worries, can cause such highly acid gastric juice to be poured into his stomach as to cause cancer there. This is one of the discoveries of psycho-somatic medicine. The cancer, by its painfulness, may further aggravate the man's unhappy disposition.

Berman wrote a best-selling book on *The Glands Regulating Personality*, in which he attributed a specific influence

on personality to every endocrine gland. Thus Napoleon's career was due to his being a thymo-centric with pre-pituitary tendencies which fell off in his later years. This was too sensational to be accurate ; but we do know that hormones from the pre-pituitary stimulate intelligence, that thyroid defect may cause both goitre and cretinism with consequent dullness, and that the glands form a means more archaic than the nervous system whereby the body movements were coordinated.

Diseases of various kinds also may affect the disposition both directly and indirectly. The direct form is best known in the case of fevers; and malaria in particular tends to leave its victims debilitated for a long time or permanently. By indirectly, I mean, in such ways as that a child who is sick a great deal and thus gains for himself an unfair share of his mother's attention may thereby become "spoiled" and psychologically unfit for life's struggles.

Neustatter of London wrote an interesting book on the way that illnesses have determined the careers of many famous men and the course of history.

I have mentioned as an evil apt to accompany social adaptation, the tendency of people becoming mere conformists. Abandoning the guidance of instinct while still not having worked out standards of our own, we drift with the tide. We develop artificial tastes for foods that are excessively sweet or sour or highly spiced or otherwise unwholesome. We drink hot beverages containing caffeine or cold ones containing alcohol, we neglect rules of health and take little enjoyment out of nature or out of beauty. And there is no help in us !

Let us begin by enquiring into the causes of alcoholism, tobacconism and drug addiction, all of which are recognized to be harmful and enslaving.

By alcoholism I do not mean the occasional drinking of a glass of wine or liquor because we like the flavor or out of

concession to what others are doing. I mean the inability to refuse that glass when available and the sense of deprivation if it is not forthcoming. And I would begin by pointing out that while a majority of drinkers are able to remain in the former class indefinitely, there is a minority who are simply incapable of doing so. There may be in their case some glandular deficiency or inherent predisposition. The consumption of very large quantities of alcohol, over a long period of time, itself produces changes of a bio-chemical character, however, so that the line of separation of the two classes is not rigid.

Alcoholism used to be approached from the moral angle, and religious conversion was thought to be the only cure. Religious treatment is still the one used in Salvation Army shelters and also depended on a great deal, along with the helpful companionship of reformed drunkards, by the organization—Alcoholics Anonymous—which is doing better work than any other to cure alcoholism. Religion has an advantage in the powerful emotional forces it is able to bring to bear. However, alcoholism is now regarded as an illness rather than a perverse vice—an illness chiefly psychological.

The infant sucking at his mother's nipple does so not merely because his body requires proteins, fats and carbohydrates. Besides his chemically induced hunger, he is impelled by the pleasure he gets from titillation of the lip-zone. His *libido* is in its earliest, auto-erotic, stage, that of oral (or mouth-zone) erotism.

In time, he gets his pleasure more from other zones of the body as the bulk of his *libido* passes on to invest them; but not *all* the interest ever goes out of the area, and so there always remains some oral erotism to be satisfied. From his mother's nipple, he is weaned to a bottle with a rubber teat; but after that he takes his milk out of a glass. Thus you will find him looking round for something

to suck, and he is given a teething-ring or a lollipop. In place of the milk and the lollipop are presently introduced sweet drinks or those like ginger-ale which slightly sting the lips and mouth. Finally, when the now young man or woman begins on alcoholic drinks and cigarettes, these become a principal channel thru which oral erotism is satisfied.

The next libidinal drive which becomes switched to the drink-habit is that of narcissism or self-love, especially in its sublimated form of a desire to be able to respect oneself. We all have our pretensions to worth. But as we grow older we find ourselves falling short of the aims we had so confidently set for ourselves and not achieving as much as some of our schoolmates whom we had always looked down on. A drink, operating physiologically to cut off certain emotional areas of the brain, inhibits these inferiority feelings and puts us "on top of the world" again temporarily.

Especially if we are going to a gathering where we will be put to a test in front of other people—we may doubt if we can possibly make good. Maybe it is a dinner where sprightly conversation, if not an after dinner speech, will be expected of us. With a couple of drinks inside our belt, we might be able to face it.

Of course, the rub is that in this way we develop an ever greater dependence on the drink to see us thru the most ordinary routines. We take one before leaving the house in the morning and one before meals, and the amount needed to secure the necessary effect becomes ever larger. This is a danger point at which we should take warning.

The next drive to be enlisted is the homo-sexual one—enjoyment of close contact with our own sex. This is really the most important one in beginning the habit. One assembles with one's pals around the bar, and the drinks circulate as an element of good fellowship. With enough drinks, men begin to put their arms around each other lovingly, and

to weep in a maudlin manner on one another's shoulders. Dr. Edward Glover found that nearly all alcoholics he was called on to treat were homo-sexual.

When one begins drinking alone, he has reached another danger point and should try to pull himself up.

The fourth drive which deserves notice in this connection is the hetero-sexual. Partly, of course, this comes in, in connection with the drinking in mixed company which has become popular within hardly more than a generation—the posh, tastefully furnished bar having superseded the old all-male saloon no longer seen except in “western” movies.

I am thinking, however, of the man who drinks because he is sexually impotent. A small amount of alcohol increases sexual desire, and this fools many men into thinking it increases their potency—though actually, it diminishes it.

Moreover, the man's fear of woman may be for the time inhibited and his imagination stimulated so that he goes about bragging of fictitious conquests and prowess. In time, the sexual energies seem to become more and more channeled into this form of gratification.

In the later stages of alcoholism, the quantities which have to be consumed and the inability to control the impulse advance rapidly. He turns up late or not at all at his job or in an inebriated condition so that he is fired. This increases his feeling of inferiority, and soon he is arrested for driving when drunk or is picked up from the gutter.

Tobacconism—the next habit I shall deal with—is seldom attended by such obvious dramatic consequences and so it is easily excused as harmless. Promoted by billions of dollars of advertising, it has become almost universal. Medical research has conclusively proven it to be a cause of cancer of the lungs and mouth, and insurance statistics show that the average smoker has ten years less life expect-

tancy than the non-smoker. Such statistical studies as those of Mylan on students at Columbia and of Earp, at Antioch, and experimental researches by Hull at Clark University, long ago proved that smoking definitely handicaps a student in his efforts to attain high or passing grades. Add to this the waste of money which it entails, the facts that almost one-third of all fires are attributed to smokers' carelessness, its unaesthetic aspects, and the habituation it gives in disregarding others' comfort, and the case against a custom affecting hundreds of millions of human beings really becomes weighty. What is its psychological hold ?

Obviously the mouth-erotism which we saw as a factor in drinking plays an even greater role in smoking. Cigarette, pipe, or cigar rest on the lip and stimulate it—the hot pipe resting on the lower lip is the greatest cause of lip-cancer. The adult sucks away at those as the baby sucked at the nipple and draws in the stimulating fluid. In an old English poem, the expression is used "*Drink tobacco*". There is a common saying "a man with a pipe is like a baby with a comforter". When they meet with some disappointment, smokers will seek solace from their habit exactly the way unhappy children regress to thumb-sucking.

A motive peculiar to smoking, and which the smoker at once misses when he swears off, is the fingering of the cigarette, the tamping down of tobacco in the pipe, etc. This factor has been compared to nail-biting.

The phallic symbolism of cigarette, pipe and cigar is obvious—long cylinders emitting fluid. The Young and Rubicam advertising agency found that young men were embarrassed smoking such strong virility symbols as cigars, while Weiss and Galler of Chicago found that small men smoked them to help them feel big.

At the beginning of the habit (of smoking), narcissism plays its part, in the following manner. Parents who themselves smoke, forbid their children to do so ; so that smok-

ing becomes a coveted sign of adulthood. Many boarding schools also are psychologically so naive as to allow smoking from the sixth form but do not allow younger boys to indulge in smoking which, therefore, they do secretly. Women as a sex once were barred from smoking by public opinion, which regarded it as masculine. But when the feminist movement took hold, women started smoking as a sign of their emancipation. Another narcissistic motive in smoking is the fancy that it makes one seem to have "poise" or to be daring.

Homo-sexuality plays much the same role in the beginning of smoking as in drinking—one takes it up in a crowd of one's age-group and as a mark of conformity. It is pre-eminently a herd-minded type of behavior at the outset but then one gets "hooked" and must continue it in solitude.

Aggressivity, finally, is gratified by smoking. Good manners formerly forbade smoking in many places, and it is well known that a number of persons find the smell intensely disagreeable if not nauseating. Nevertheless, smokers have forced acceptance of their habit everywhere. The Chicago advertising agent, Edward Weiss, found that the occasional gesture of a smoker in asking ladies if they objected to his cigar was seldom sincere and that, as quoted by Vance Packard, "He knows darned well he is going to stink up the room," but is defiant.

The psychology of addiction to the stronger drugs is more difficult to unravel. Dr. Edward Glover, of London, who is an authority on the subject, considers that, as with alcohol and tobacco addiction, both oral erotism and homo-sexuality are almost always strong factors.

A common course, among delinquent youths in America, is to begin with tobacco, go on to marijuana, and from it to heroin. The stronger drug is usually substituted for the milder—the milder can seldom be substituted for the stronger. In China, the smoking of opium was first intro-

duced thru the medium of opiated cigarettes, which created presently a demand for the pure opium. Last month I was told by Police Colonel Amroon Skulratana and others that the closing of the opium dens in Bangkok in 1958 was, however, followed shortly by an onset of heroin-addiction which was proving far more insidious and harder to eradicate.

Glover considers that, in the course of addiction, the normal desire for sex satisfaction becomes channelled into the craving for the drug. This seems to explain why impotence is one of the consequences of addiction.

Illness is commonly assumed to be a condition which no one desires but that everyone fights against. In some cases, the situation is more clear to the pseudo-sick person. I know of one man who quite deliberately decided that a normal life was just not worth the bother. He took to his bed, where his devoted wife and daughter waited on him ; he read novels all day long, and he never got up again until his death some four years later. The doctor, or at any rate the psychotherapist, becomes aware that in many people only their conscious mind wishes to recover, while unconsciously they are content with the advantages which ill-health brings them. These advantages include immunity from many demands which otherwise would be made on them : being waited on and so exerting considerable power over the rest of the family ; and being the center of attention.

Such persons, together with hypochondriacs, are frequently those who in childhood were confined to bed by some genuine illness. Here they drew to themselves, at the expense of their jealous siblings, an unprecedented amount of attention from their mother ; were called on by sympathizing friends and playmates ; and received presents of candies and toys. In other cases, it was not themselves but a sibling who fell ill and got all these benefits, but in either case the advantages of being ill were strongly impressed on them.

Attention has been drawn in late years to the psychosomatic disorders. These are genuine physical illnesses, but their cause is to be looked for in some psychological factor. For instance, a great number of gastric cancers seems to accompany the advance of western civilization with its pressures.

The famous stigmata which seem well authenticated in the case of certain Christian saints were doubtless psychosomatic. We know that in hypnosis a flow of blood towards some part of the body can be produced. A Saint Theresa dwells constantly on the agonies which Jesus suffered on the cross. She identifies herself with him, imagining the cruel nails piercing her hands and feet as they did his. This would certainly cause tumescence of those regions, which could in some cases, at least if an abrasion accidentally occurred, cause bleeding.

Such cases are not to be confused with those of conversion-hysterias where there is no organic basis at all, but where the patient developes a malfunctioning of some organ as an unconscious symbol of a mental attitude. Such an example can be found described in the Christian *Bible* where Saul, who had been persecuting the Christians until his sudden conversion, became temporarily blind. This was not due to any physical mishap to his eyes but pretty obviously was an acting out of the thought, surcharged with guilt, "In persecuting these innocent people, how blind I have been" !

Or take Freud and Breuer's famous first case, a young woman. The paralysis of her arm was cured when she was able to recall and relieve an occasion when, under tension of a great emotional conflict, she had fallen asleep with the arm so hanging over the back of her chair that the blood supply was cut off. Prevented from marrying her lover by the duty of caring for her sick father, her own situation was well symbolized by the arm.

Very commonly, as I hinted in our first lecture, speech defects such as stammering are an organic way of saying "I am impotent" !

Perhaps the most familiar examples of the influence of mind over body are offered by states of grief. Not only does intense sorrow cause tears to be secreted, but the whole bodily metabolism is changed. Muscles lose their tones ; head and shoulders droop ; the gait becomes staggering ; food is refused ; and accident-proneness is increased—the body is saying "I have no wish to live". Thanatos has triumphed over Eros.

Let us by way of contrast note what impulses make for the cultivation of health. We may generally assume that all the physiological instincts are active within normal limits under stimulus of this desire.

Hunger functions efficiently in wild animals to direct them to the foods, and the right quantities of these, to supply their physiological requirements. Since wild animals have neither doctors nor dieticians to advise them, all species which could not rely on their instincts perished and left few inheritors.

So must it have been with primitive man ; and experiments with infants soon after weaning them from their mothers' milk show that instinct is an adequate guide to them, too, to select the right foods. Candy and jam and coffee and highly spiced or hard-to-digest foods and drinks may be placed before them, but, so long as they have an adequate choice of wholesomer things, they will shun the unwholesome ones.

Unfortunately, our parents and guardians did not leave us alone in our food-choices. Of one food—say, products containing much canesugar—they forbade us to take more than a small quantity, with the result that we came to think of those as rare treats which we would gorge ourselves on whenever we were not supervised. Others—say, spinach—

they forced us to eat more of than we wished so that we came to hate them. Or their recommendation of one as healthy—say, in the case of roast beef—so hyponotised us that all our lives we have had a moral compulsion to gorge ourselves on an unnecessary quantity of it, destroying the balance of our dietary. Besides this, the greater cheapness of some foods—*e.g.* rice—or for some people, the prestige of some dish just because it was too expensive for anyone less rich than ourselves to eat, has affected our choice. Finally, the habit of eating rapidly and while chatting socially with table companions is contrary to the condition necessary for recovery of our capacity to select foods thru instinctive taste, namely their attentive leisurely enjoyment and the rejection of all which we are not sure we like.

Forms of natural behavior which are interfered with by antiquated or superstitious health ideas are very numerous ; I will take as an example our phobia of low temperatures. Medical men know that the common head cold is essentially the result of a virus. Arctic explorers, who live for months amid snow and icy winds where this virus cannot survive testify to complete freedom from colds until they return to civilization with its infectious dusts. Yet in the west, at any rate, the instant you open a window to ventilate a smoke-filled and overheated room, all the old ladies present will protest violently and some will start sneezing. What is the explanation ?

I cannot give a scientifically authenticated answer. Warmth, however, has, from our womb-existence thru infancy and childhood, been associated with mother, comfort, security, and well-being. In northern climates, the outdoors, with all its dangers, is generally cold and one retreats from it into the motherly warmth of the home.

Athletes owe much of their motivation to anal sadism and masochism. Control is the essential thing striven for

on the track or in the arena. The contestant in training must not yield to pain, fatigue, lassitude, the temptations of tobacco and strong drink, or sexual indulgence. He must deny himself as masochistically as any ascetic. He must train regularly. On a field day, he hopes for the sadistic joy of triumphing over an adversary. In the boxing or wrestling ring, he tries deliberately to pain and punish the opponent.

Working generally in favor of health is narcissism. It is natural to look down on people who are sickly and weak and complain of their ailments. Children will cruelly ridicule a companion who is crippled. We say "the lowest form of conversation is when people compare their symptoms". Says the *Old Testament*: "The young man rejoiceth in his strength"—and most old people pretend to themselves they are younger than they are.

Advertisements of gymnastic apparatus and the pages of physical culture magazines feature pictures of young men flexing their arm muscles (sometimes in front of a mirror) and of beautiful young women in bikinis. What professional strong men and gymnasts the present speaker has known were markedly narcissistic.

A closely related motive, especially pronounced among those who perform in public, is exhibitionism. What can gratify this impulse more than to be "the handsome young man on the flying trapeze" thrilling a circus crowd, or the hero-worshipped boxer or wrestler displaying his grit and skill before cheering fans including, nowadays, plenty of sport-loving women?

The allo-erotic motivations are also gratified by health activities and sports, since a strong physique and physical beauty nearly always attract friends and increase sex-appeal. It is usual for advertisements of mechanical exercisers and gymnasiums to include a testimonial from someone claiming that before he took up training his puny phy-

sique was despised by all the girls but now he is the center of their regard.

People often express awe and wonder at the presence of the beautiful in nature and ask how it came into being. The first answer to be made is that the beauty does not lie in the external objects themselves but "in the eye of the beholder"—or, more strictly, in his mental make up. Creatures living on other planets, amid entirely different sights and sounds, creatures evolved differently from ourselves, doubtless ascribe beauty to a wholly different category of objects.

As creatures possessing sense-perceptions and able to grasp *gestalts* or configurations and to form associative connections, we would not inevitably be affected by such with exactly equivalent amounts of pleasure. If the *gestalts* and colors which our forest-dwelling ancestors encountered continuously, such as the sounds of running waters and of bird-calls and the vision of green foliage and trees and flowers and mountains and sky acted as irritants, then these ancestors were biologically ill-suited to that environment. Made unhappy, they would have had less vitality than competing creatures to whom these things brought joy, and so would have died out in the struggle for survival. When, however, we move from such generalities to the question of precisely why the *gestalt* of a particular flower or the particular laws which govern musical harmony and not some other *gestalts* or laws happen to be the ones which result in pleasurable compositions, we can only guess. Probably they have been more typically associated with, or symbolize, unknown gratifying features of our world.

The ancient Greeks discovered that if a line be so divided that the shorter part be to the longer as the longer is to the whole, this division is more pleasing to a majority of people than any other. They found that if a rectangle's width be to its length as the length is to a diagonal drawn from

corner to corner, this rectangle pleases us more than does one of any other proportions.

In modern times, it has been found that combinations of colors from the opposite parts of the spectrum, such as yellow with blue or black, are more pleasing than those which are close together such as salmon with orange, except that if the closeness is very great indeed such as yellow with burnt orange this may please; or if the colors are very quiet such as blue, green or gray, it's O.K.

The Greeks also discovered the pleasing effect of symmetry and even more pleasing effect of balance—where the two sides are not alike but the greater size or strength of one side is compensated for by some different but equally interesting factors on the part of the other.

Experimental psychologists have shown that most pleasures grow with the intensity of their exciting cause from an imperceptible minimum to their optimum point. Further intensity or volume of the exciting cause does not increase the pleasure but may even turn it into displeasure.

This is really all that has been formulated and verified experimentally in psychological esthetics.

A new approach was made, however, when Freud and his disciples began applying to the interpretation of art-works the principles they had learned in psycho-analysing neurotic patients. No claim has been made that the results have the same validity as actual analyses carried on with a living patient, nor do they establish rules of the beautiful to guide the artist.

To begin with, works of art greatly resemble dreams, which Freud had shown, in his epoch-making book *The Analysis of Dreams*, to represent the disguised fulfilment of unconscious wishes. The elongated and pointed objects may be assumed to have the same phallic significance, hollow objects the same womb or maternal reference, in a picture as in a dream. But this will not get us very far.

More interesting are connections found between works of art and aspects of the artist's life, as where the haunting smile of Leonardo's mother appears on the mouth of all his women—most famously Mona Lisa—or as where Andrea del Sarto's work reflects the fluctuations of his miserable love affair.

The drawings of children exhibit a simple naïveté which is amusing and rather charming. They show both ends of a house at the same time and often people and objects in it as though the walls were transparent. In picturing a human being, they tend to depict the head large out of all proportion to the body. They have little conception of perspective. The explanation is, that they draw what they think rather than what they observe, and exaggerate what interests them over what is commonplace.

When they become older and more critical, or have been given lessons by sophisticated adults, their art gains correctness at the expense of spontaneity.

We see a similar change in the oldest drawings and paintings known to man. In the caves of the people of the first stone age, as at Altamira in Spain, you will see pictures painted 30,000 years ago which are like those of talented children. They contain absurdities, but they are good art. By comparison the art of the later stone age betrays the characteristics of a sophisticated race who have developed rationality and critical powers. They are stiff and awkward and poor as art.

The fact that an artistic creation betrays the personality and emotions of the artist has been made use of in mental diagnostics. In particular, Dr. Baines, in England, has written extensively on this theme, illustrating his work with pictures drawn by his patients. The art of the insane is wild and peculiar; and the comment has been made that much of modern non-representational art resembles it. In the Rohrschach test, the reverse process is used of having the subject interpret a visual image.

The Freudian constructions are easier to trace in literature than in the visual arts. The Oedipus complex, or conflict in a man's mind between his duty and affection towards his father on the one hand and, on the other, unconscious jealousy of and antagonism towards him, is an especially frequent theme. The two greatest masterpieces built upon it are *Oedipus Rex* and *Hamlet*.

The fact that a story writer will put into his tale material that betrays his own complexes and emotional values is made use of in thematic apperception tests and completion tests. In the former, a picture of several persons in a suggestive grouping is shown and the subject is asked to give an imaginative account of what the situation represents. In the latter, a verbal story is begun and the subject is asked to carry the story on from that point. These tests, together with the Rohrschach, have proved to have considerable diagnostic value.

One great art which I have not yet mentioned is architecture. I don't, as a matter of fact, know of any psychological study in this field unless it be a not very penetrating book by a noted Los Angeles architect on the influence of architecture on community life. The style of a building is determined by many factors such as its purpose, the special wishes and tastes of the person or persons who are paying the bill, the materials used, technical knowledge in the age when it was built, and the vogue of the time. It is difficult to disentangle from these many specific contributions indicating much about the character of the architect himself even if he be a great genius like Sir Christopher Wren or Frank Lloyd Wright.

What architecture does reveal is rather the ideals of a civilization or an age. The architecture of Mohenjodaro is that of an unmaterialistic people, free of the fear of war and guiding their lives by rules of auspiciousness deduced from the phenomena of nature—*rta*.

The architectural monuments of Ankor Wat and of ancient Thebes tell of a people groaning, and, therefore, necessarily full of hate, under an absolute and defiant tyrant whose obsessions were his own glory in this life and his security in the next.

The soaring Gothic constructions of mediaeval Europe testify, by their phallic symbolism, to a gross sexuality condemned by a conscious devotion of the architect, artisans and people to other-worldly ideals. The chateaux, spacious formal gardens featuring statues and fountains, and grandiose public gardens of French Louis XIV betray an age of hard-hearted luxury in an aristocracy indifferent to the sufferings (and inseparable hatreds) of the prostrate peasantry.

Finally, what of contemporary functionalistic architecture, trimmed of the extraneous embellishments of an earlier period but emphasizing the relationship of masses, purity of line, and natural richness of materials and fabrics? An architecture reaching its greatest heights in North and South America but reflected in every metropolis of the world? Future social psychologists will read from it the following characteristics of our age: technical advancement; utilitarianism; sincerity, contemptuous of pretentious furbelows; penetration into true principles of beauty; revolt against traditionalism; cosmopolitanism.

V

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

IN YESTERDAY'S lecture, we were concerned with the creative arts; but the supreme creation is a beautiful human character.

The terms character and personality have not yet received universally accepted definitions in Psychology. I shall use "character" to mean especially the temperament, deeper drives, and ultimate goals of the person. I shall use personality to mean all this plus any other elements and especially the mannerisms and superficial qualities which he shows to others.

We have seen what the crude forces are which must go into the making of this being. Returning to our initial simile of the tree, we have at its heart the fundamental urges—the biologically life-supporting, the libidinous with its many stages, the flight impulse and the destructive urge.

If we act upon one of the impulses derived from these urges, then so long as nothing impedes attaining the goal we had in mind, we experience pleasure. The effect of pleasure is, to confirm the drive that was concerned and weave it into our character.

Suppose, however, our activity is not so successful and that we meet with an obstacle. One of several courses may then be taken.

Maybe the frustration will stir up anger in us and the combative tendency with its accompanying secretion of adrenalin. The result may be a more determined attack which overcomes the obstacle. This results in the emotion of triumph, the pleasure of which still more strengthens the original drive, building it more firmly into us.

In other cases, the frustration may lead the person to *compensate*. Thus, a boy who was refused a job because he was too ignorant may be stimulated to become a famous scholar.

Or maybe after the first or after several attempts we say to ourselves, "Well, I should have liked to have done this thing, but since I can't, I will renounce it until at least some more favorable time." This is accompanied by disappointment, with its feeling-tone of displeasure, and the drive is suppressed (note that I do not say repressed) and weakened as an element in our character.

The above ways of reacting to frustration are all wholesome. There is, however, another way. We may be "boiling inside" but say to ourselves "I don't care! I never really wanted to do that—I was just pretending to!" This is the method of repression. We seem to have got rid of the desire, but actually only from our conscious and fore-conscious thinking. It lives on in the unconscious, held there by what Freud calls the *censor*. But it can escape the censor if it puts on a disguise.

One kind of disguise is by Displacement. Let us suppose that the original wish of a small boy who had been thrashed by his father was to beat up his father. This having been repressed, the hate may be displaced into a series of substitutes—he beats up his small brother and then the boy next door. When he becomes a man, as the result of repressing anger at many such beatings, he may develop the character of a criminal.

Another disguise is by Projection. One thinks, "It is not I who hate other people, it is they who hate me. If I fight, it is only in self defence against my attackers". This attitude may in extreme cases become a paranoid persecution obsession in which the victim runs to the authorities with tales of how his enemies are trying to poison him. Or he may deny his self-accusation of guilt by claiming that it is the passers-by in the street who mutter scandals about him.

A third disguise of the repressed is by Conversion into an hysteric symptom. Thus if we suppose that the wish to beat up his father created strong feelings of guilt in the son, he might convert the conflicts into a paralysis of the arm. Or he might introject his aggressivity inward on himself by some form of masochistic behavior, *e.g.* failing to pass examinations—a fourth kind of disguise.

A fifth disguise takes the form of Dreams and Nightmares. In these, some person or animal may stand for one's father and another for oneself. For further disguise, the action which takes place in the dream may be made the reverse of what is actually wished.

Finally, the repressed drive may be disguised by sublimation. This term is used when some permissible or even useful activity is substituted for the forbidden one. For example, the wish to attack the father may become the driving power behind a passion for playing chess, in which game the object, of course, is to render powerless the opposing king (kings are well-known father surrogates). Ernest Jones in a masterly essay showed that such a father-hatred was actually the force behind the world-chess champion, Morphy. Many lawyers and other business or professional men owe their success to a useful sublimation of aggressivity.

So much for the psycho-genesis of some of what my old professor of psychiatry at Harvard, Dr. E. H. Southard, used to call the principal *morbi* or *mala*—evils which plague mankind—at least those inherent in personality defects. I propose to consider under three heads the methods that have been devised to heal them—namely, methods of Pressure, methods of Probing, and methods of Vitalizing.

The method of Pressure is related, of course, to conation, to decision-making, and to willing—even if the decision or will accepted be that of another person, as I shall explain.

Most of our daily activities are triggered simply by habit. At certain hours we arise, perform our ablutions, dress,

breakfast and depart for our work, without even asking ourselves why. When there comes a check to our usual routine or an opportunity to do something that promises greater satisfaction, the need for a decision arises. This may come "very easy" with a sense of "of course" so and so. In other cases, we find ourselves faced with such a conflict of values and of interests that we feel we must take time out to think matters over. In the normal course of things, we do eventually see that one or the other course is the more to our liking, and embark upon it.

The earlier psychologists, or rather psychological philosophers, assumed that an act of will consisted in a simple overbalancing of the scale by the weightier or more numerous considerations. The school of Psychological Hedonists considered that it resulted from our perceiving that one course would bring us more happiness than would the other. William James pointed out a large variety of types of acts of will which included, but by no means were limited to, these two.

It remained, however, for the German psychologist Ach and two Frenchmen, Michotte and Prum, to investigate, some thirty years ago, the nature of the volitional process experimentally. By inducing their subjects to perform a number of slightly unpleasant tasks requiring acts of will, and getting their introspections afterward, they established two important facts. One was that the act of will was made, not when one started to carry out the unpleasant performance but on accepting, *in the beginning*, that one *would* do it. The other fact was that the act of will consists in identifying one of the courses of action *with one's self*.

The second conclusion is especially interesting because it largely checks with and states in different language the conclusions reached independently in the course of his psycho-analytic investigations, by Freud. To him, the act of will represents the triumph of the *super-ego* over the *id*.

The way in which an act of will overcomes *morbi* and *mala* such as criminality, academic or business failure, alcoholism, and mental ill-health is well known. One says to himself, "See here, this simply won't do ! I am ruining my life and bringing disgrace to my family by the way I'm acting ! I *will* overcome these tendencies !" And the more surely to succeed, he picks a conspicuous day, such as New Year's Day or his birthday, to begin a new life ; takes an oath before God ; and notifies all his friends so that they may be witnesses.

Pressure may be exerted also by the wills of outside persons. In childhood, moral rules reinforced by the sanctions of father and mother restrained us first by fear of being caught. Then, when we had incorporated these rules into our super-ego, they became yet more permanent as the pressure of conscience.

Meantime, our age-group and the community at large took over, threatening unpopularity or ridicule if we did not follow their folk-ways. This was the pressure to conform.

The criminal is pressured by the fear of arrest, imprisonment, and social ostracism. Evil-doers, in addition, are pressured by the representatives of religion, who tell them that damnation into hell or purgatory by a righteous God or rebirth into a degraded existence thru bad *karma* will be the result of their continuing to sin.

The person who fails at college or in business must expect to meet the pressures of parental disapproval, loss of status, and poverty.

The alcoholic faces the grief of his family, the contempt of neighbors and, perhaps, loss of his job and general ruin.

The neurotic brings to failure his ambitions, his marriage, his relationships with his friends and his children.

This brings us to consider the pressure types of Psychotherapy.

From the onset of the dark ages in Europe until Pinel loosened their chains in France, the mentally disordered were treated like criminals. Ultimately, this was based on the idea that the sufferer's body had become the habitation of one or more evil spirits such as those whom Jesus, who apparently held this view, drove out of a man and into the Gadarene swine. Where religious exorcism would not drive them out, it was hoped that the pressure of imprisonment and pain might succeed. Nor can we say that the punitive method of curing psychotics and psycho-neurotics is hundred per cent failure. At least where their disorder serves the end of escape from an unpleasant situation—*e.g.* the war-neurosis which excuses a soldier from the field of battle—the fear of incurring something even more unpleasant, such as punishment and disgrace, may bring the patient to “pull himself together”.

Famous personages, moreover—rulers, priests and saints especially—have always been accredited with the power to command a sick person to become well. “The king's touch”, or even the touch of his garment, was thought to heal. Paracelsus invented new modes of ministering the agent which he called “animal magnetism” and achieved fabulous renown. Under Mesmer's somewhat more rational handling, it became known as “mesmerism”. Braid, thru renaming it hypnotism, first secured for it the serious consideration of physicians and scientists. His contemporary, Esdaille, performed surgical operations under hypnotism, and had his most brilliant successes here in India.

Advances in hypnotic therapy went on under the great Charcot and Janet at the Salpetriere Hospital in Paris and under Bernheim and Liebault at Nancy. Charcot demonstrated a kinship between hysteria and hypnotic trance. Janet invented the misleading theory that mental illness was caused by the splitting apart of the personality, which the hypnotist must, therefore, contrive to press

together. The Nancy school discovered that there is no distinction of kind, but only of degree, between hypnotism and suggestibility in the waking state, a point to which Binet (*La Suggestibilité*) added experimental evidence. Finally, this school produced the pharmacist-psychologist, Emile Coué, whose theories on Auto-Suggestion and his formula "Every day, in every way, I'm getting better and better!" had a prodigious vogue in the '20s.

Hypnotism and suggestibility still impress people as something weird and uncanny. They remained substantially unexplained until Dr. Ernest Jones set himself this task. He pointed out that there are two techniques for hypnotizing a person. One consists in overawing him with bold, authoritative commands. The other method is, to talk to him soothingly in a low, gentle voice. The former method recalls the manner of an average father with his child; the latter, that of a mother lulling her infant to sleep. Jones reached the conclusion that these two parental figures were exactly what the hypnotist, commanding or pleading, stood for to the child's unconscious. The hypnotic sleep or state of extreme waking suggestibility are temporary regressions back to infancy, when we believed and obeyed unquestioningly our father's orders or the voice of our mother quieting us. The hypnotist becomes for a time our parent as we thought of him or her in our trustful babyhood.

Hypnotic therapy went into a decline because of two events. One was the discovery of chemical agents such as chloroform, ether, and nitrous oxide, which seemed more dependable means of ensuring anaesthesia for surgery. The other was the rise of psycho-analysis as a more potent instrument for curing the psycho-neuroses. Suggestion-therapy has, by comparison with analysis, the disadvantage that it works in the dark upon symptoms, the cause of which may remain unknown; that consequently new symptoms

tend to replace those "cured"; that since it operates by forcing foreign ideas upon the patient these tend presently to be thrown off, so that the "cure" is not permanent; and that hypnotism can be practiced often better by an impressive charlatan than by a physician who shrinks from self-inflation.

Nevertheless, hypnotic and suggestive therapy have recently enjoyed a revival. They have real uses where speed is all-important, as, in returning to the battlefield a soldier who was a mental casualty, or where there is reason for preferring them to chemical anaesthetics for surgery.

Probing, as a method of healing *morbi*, is also very old but made no great technical advance until the present century. "Know thyself" was written over the gate of ancient Thebes, and was quoted by Socrates as "an old saying". Socrates set the young men of Athens to questioning their presumptions and examining their processes of thought. But it escaped him as it did nearly all thinkers prior to Pestalozzi and von Hartmann that the most dangerous thoughts and emotions may be unconscious; and that we needed some instrument for probing more subtle than the direct question.

Although he did not specifically state the problem thus, it seems to have been grasped by a supremely great intuitive mind in India 2,500 years ago—Siddartha Gautama, the Buddha. He included as the seventh step in his Eightfold Path, *Sattipatthana* (right mindfulness), in which one is to observe the thoughts and emotions which come spontaneously into one's mind during meditation, acknowledging each frankly, looking into its origin and assessing its significance before dismissing it. Those who have practiced this technique at great enough length claim that it leads gradually to a release from the tumult of passions thru self-understanding. It may be considered, therefore, as an amazing anticipation of the free-association method which was the

foundation of psycho-analysis. By this, I do *not*, of course, mean that the Buddha anticipated the whole of psycho-analysis—that would be an absurd claim.

Freud had no knowledge of *Sattipatthana* nor even of von Hartmann's speculations on unconscious thinking nor Pestalozzi's on emotional conflicts with resulting repression, when he commenced psychiatric practice in Vienna in partnership with Breuer, by the hypnotic method. Breuer had a woman patient whose arm was paralysed. Under hypnosis she reproduced incidents from her past. The two doctors then observed that whenever this enabled her to live thru again in her waking state the events connected with the onset of one of the psycho-neurotic symptoms, the symptoms tended to disappear. Thus, her principal symptom (she had many others), the paralysis of her arm, disappeared when she re-lived a scene when she had been in love with a young man but felt she couldn't marry him because her sick father needed her. Once she fell asleep by her father's bedside with her arm over the back of a chair in such a way that the arm became numb. After she awoke the arm remained paralyzed, apparently as a symbolical expression of her emotional state, and her fingers looked to her like snakes.

The various symptoms of this case and of others on which the two doctors worked also impressed Freud with their sexual nature. A remark he had accidentally heard Charcot make, and another by the psychiatrist Chrobach, seemed to indicate that these men too had come to this view—yet they would not say so frankly to their students so terrific was the taboo against frankness regarding sex in the Victorian age in Europe. In fact, when Freud tried to make Breuer face up to their observations, Breuer broke off their partnership.

Until now, Freud still depended on hypnosis as the instrument of probing, and on his patients *abreacting*, or

working off, and *catharsis* or cleaning out, their symptoms by talking their emotions out. There has been a revival of this method lately along with the revival of hypnotic treatment I have mentioned. It had, and still has, however, two great drawbacks. Not every patient could be hypnotized—at least not by Freud. Secondly, the information obtained during hypnotic trance tends to be rejected and forgotten again when the patient awakes.

To overcome these obstacles, Freud invented the method of “free association” in the waking stage. The patient reclines on a couch in order that his mind may be more free to go into reverie than if he were facing the doctor as in an ordinary consultation. There is one absolute rule he must then follow, namely to tell with complete frankness every thing which occurs to him regardless of how unimportant, humiliating, shameful, or irrelevant it may seem. The doctor, in an easy chair at the head of the couch, does not often ask questions nor make notes but allows his mind to play around the patient’s communications, noting all peculiar connections, mannerisms, and so forth. From time to time he offers the patient for his consideration, but does not authoritatively impose, some comment or interpretation of what the patient’s remarks seem to imply about his emotional life or his childhood experiences. The psycho-analytic view is that one’s personality takes its shape principally from the experiences of infancy analogously to the way that a pearl takes its shape from the particle of foreign matter which initially irritated the oyster into secreting material around it.

Freud’s most famous book was his *The Analysis of Dreams*. In this he showed that though we build up our dreams from events of the day, the sleeper arranges this “manifest content”, as Freud calls it, to clothe a “latent content” which is a story or symbolical picture about a repressed wish. The dream is not governed by the laws of

waking-condition logic but by laws of its own, which Freud studied and elucidated. He called the dream "the royal road to the unconscious", but in practice psycho-analysts are not overly dependent on it.

Freud showed that the sex impulse does not, as had been assumed, arise fully developed in adolescence but that it begins with the sensuality of the mouth in infants and develops thru the series of libidinous stages which I explained in our first lecture, until it reaches the adult form. This theory, known as that of Infantile Sexuality, was met by incredulity, ridicule and a degree of actual hate and persecution from the supposedly scientific men of his time which can hardly be believed today.

When Freud had largely won his battle against direct opposition, the antagonism to his hard-won discoveries took the new form of *soi-disant* "improvements". Dr. Alfred Adler was the first of his adherents to turn away and form his school of Individual Psychology, rejecting practically the whole theory of the unconscious and explaining all neuroses as due to "manly protest" against some organic inferiority of the patient—a changed version of Freud's theory of overcompensation for an inferiority complex.

A greater loss to the movement was that of Dr. Karl C. Jung, who formed the School of Analytical Psychology. For the idea of the unconscious it substitutes the "sub-conscious" and from another speculation of Freud develops the concepts of a "racial unconscious" common to all humanity and corresponding somewhat to *Brahman* in Hinduism. Within this racial unconscious lurk "archetypes" which account for dreams and myths. Jungian interpretation of dreams considers these to be pointers to the future, and is not greatly interested in what they tell about the individual's past. Sex is fought shy of. Jung has a very great knowledge of oriental religions, but he is a philosopher rather than a psychologist.

Later defections were those of Rank who explained all neurosis as due to birth trauma, Karen Horney who emphasized the effects of environment and Alexander who stressed chiefly wishes connected with functions of the digestive tract.

The crucial distinction between an orthodox psychoanalyst and a follower of one of the non-Freudian schools is that the former uses the method of free association and accepts the theories of repression, unconscious conflict and infantile sexuality. Those who do not do so are not admitted to membership in the psycho-analytic associations. These associations are a kind of guild which at once assure the public of the proper qualification of members and protect members from the competition of charlatans. There are, therefore, those who accuse the Freudians of being a cult, but this is unjust. It is only on the points I have mentioned that insistence is placed.

Thus, Ferenczi of Budapest, in his endeavors to speed up analysis, experimented with some quite unusual techniques but was not on that account expelled from the movement. In London, there is wide divergence between the majority loyal to Freud's daughter Anna and the group led by Mrs. Melanie Klein, but both factions remain within the Institute. In Los Angeles, besides the Los Angeles Psycho-Analytic Society there is the Society for Medical Psycho-analysis which leans a great deal towards Karen Horney's readiness to accept a greater influence of environmental factors; yet both are members of the American Psycho-Analytic Association. Within orthodox membership there is wide diversity of opinion on other points, as anyone can verify by examining their publications.

Incidentally, one can not really settle the question often raised by lay persons as to which of the analytic schools is the predominant one today, by the clamour of partizans, but only by the amount of case material and clinical literature published by each school.

The defections of Adler and Jung brought home the fact that to join the analytic movement by no means assured a doctor's own freedom from neurotic inhibitions and impulsions. Dr. Ernest Jones, therefore, proposed to Freud that it should be required that every doctor must himself be analysed before being licenced to practice, and Jones set the example by being the first of them to undergo a brief analysis (by Ferenczi).

But, you ask, can't a person analyze *himself*? Indeed, Karen Horney has so suggested, and described a technique for doing so. And if not, who then analyzed Dr. Freud himself?

It is generally agreed that some persons can carry on a certain amount of self-analysis if they have already had at least a few months of analysis under someone else, though it is extremely difficult. Many professional analysts devote a little time daily to carrying further their own analysis. As to Freud, it was believed until after his death that he was self-analyzed. Then, however, there came to light a long correspondence he had carried on with a Dr. Fries to whom he confided many intimate facts and with whom he discussed interpretations of some of them in the light of the theories he was evolving.

Rather against Freud's expressed views was another requirement which has been adopted by the American Psycho-analytic societies and many of those in other countries. Namely, they refuse to accept any candidate for training until he has become a doctor in medicine. The reasons generally given for this are, that the analyst should be able to recognize illnesses which require treatment by bio-chemical or surgical means before he presumes to cure them psycho-therapeutically; and secondly, that the measure is necessary to protect the public against unqualified quacks.

Actually the first argument can be met by requiring that the clinical psychotherapist should cooperate with a psychi-

atrist. And the second can be met by special state licencing. Moreover, in the words used by one psychologist to answer an American Medical Association diatribe against non-medical clinical psychologists "There are MD's today who are practising psycho-therapy without even a PhD in psychology!"

The use of sodium pentathol and similar "talking drugs" has opened up interesting possibilities of advance. Not that the secrets told under influence of the drug are remembered better than we found those disclosed under hypnosis to be, but the new technique consists in making a tape-recording of this recital and in subsequent sessions playing parts of it back to the subject to stimulate his *conscious* production of more material. Let me illustrate.

An airman had so horrible an experience when the enemy shot down his plane that he could not speak of it. Under pentathol, however, he revived the whole scene, shrieking out his emotions at such harrowing scenes as the killing of his co-pilot and the struggle to bail out with his parachute. In the next analytic session as much as he could stand of his own recital was played back to him and elicited a few words of comment from him. At each subsequent session a little more was played, which he accepted and went on with until finally he was able to face and re-live the whole episode consciously.

Other modern advances are represented by group therapy and socio-drama. These have two advantages. Since a number of persons undergo them at the same time, the therapist's fee can be shared between them. Additionally, the presence of other patients with psychological problems often loosens up a patient's willingness to discuss his own.

In group psycho-therapy it is, of course, a rule of honor for mutual protection that the secrets told will not be gossipped about outside. The psycho-analyst is present as leader to keep the ball rolling, as it were, and as referee on

some point of psychology rather more than to interject interpretations constantly. The members of the group quickly pick up the psycho-analytic significance of one another's acts, remarks and dreams.

Group therapy is particularly effective if it can be alternated with occasional hours of orthodox individual analysis.

Socio-drama is somewhat similar; only, when one of the crowd brings up an episode which has distressed him, the leader suggests that the scene be acted out, the parts of the *dramatis personae* being played by various group members. The method seems to be especially effective with children, who generally love to act.

Let us say that Johnny comes to the session, much stirred up over an encounter which he had with his sister when he was leaving for school this morning. In acting out the drama, the leader, perhaps, assigns to Johnny to play the part of his sister, so that to be realistic, Johnny will have to try to see the sister's viewpoint and feel as she felt. Some other boy plays the part of Johnny, who coaches him what to say. Other children take the parts of the rest of the family who were present.

Such a play gives a chance to abreact the patient's feelings and to go on and express many things he wished to at the time but was afraid to. It can then assess the situation and his part in it with the help of a sympathetic audience.

Vitalizing was the third of the methods by which I said that man had attempted to heal the psychological *morbi* to which he is heir. We have dealt with the other two—methods of pressure and methods of probing.

I will start with a definition. By vitalizing, I mean pumping energy into a system, much as a wounded soldier may be revived by a blood-transfusion. We have all experienced vitalization who, at the end of a hot and tiring day, have dived into a cold pool.

The most terrific example of vitalization on the tragic scale occurs when a nation goes to war. So overpowering is the crisis, that all petty issues are forgotten. Our aggressive tendencies are turned, as I have mentioned, from all local targets onto the one common enemy, leaving only kindly feelings towards every member of our own community. The neighbor whom yesterday we called a skunk is today a jolly good fellow who will fight at our side against those villains across the border. No longer do we see the world in shades of gray; our countrymen and allies are snow-white and we love them all, while our enemies are deepest black and God calls on us to blow them to atoms and burn their cities with all their women and children. Thus, conscience releases all the sadism and hate that civilization had kept repressed and we are wildly energetic.

When World War I was declared, I was in Wiesbaden, Germany. I shall never forget the holy joy which seized upon everyone. Men slapped each other on the back exclaiming "Jetzt kaempfen alle Deutschen zusammen;" meaning "Now all of us, Germans and Austrians, fight side by side!" I managed to be in England when she declared war and heard everywhere almost the same enthusiastic release of emotions; in the evening, the buses were loaded with drunken celebrants. When America entered, I was on the scene there and again noted the tremendous "shot in the arm" which war gives a nation—till disillusionment comes.

Till disillusionment comes—there's the rub. The cold bath vitalizes for an hour or two. War vitalizes for a longer period but then is followed by a terrible reaction. We need something more enduring and less costly and that probably means something more spiritual.

When India was fighting for independence, there was no lack of heroes of the type of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru who were prepared to spend years, or even to die,

in prison to free their country. Moreover, the example which these leaders set awakened in the masses a spirit not only of admiration but of love; and love is, of all emotions, the greatest energizer of the spirit. Behind them stood, therefore, a people vitalized to a high pitch of morale.

Now that the great goal is achieved, however, and the greatest leader and many lesser have passed away, and all of them are out of prison, that morale is dying. We hear of corruption in high places and low, in politics and in commerce. Of course, such things exist in my own country and in most of the world, with only a few corners like the Scandinavian peninsula and Switzerland relatively exempt. (Recently a Philippine gentleman visiting Thailand asked a native "Do you have as much corruption here as in my country?" The Thai answered, "Unfortunately, yes. But we look on it as a sin, whereas you look on it as an art".) No. I speak of India only because it is the most familiar to you and well illustrates my point.

What remedy can we find for this situation? I propose to examine with you the psychological possibilities of several remedies which have been proposed.

In my country—and I am sure it is so in yours too—many people will, with great conviction, voice as the answer, "Religion! Religion alone has power to vitalize in perpetuity!" Up to this point, I am in sympathy with this idea, provided they will define the word religion broadly enough. They go on and add, however: "It is because we have drifted away from God that we have become self seekers. Back to the old-time religion!" Now, this raises at once the question, *which* old-time religion—Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, or Buddhism—to name only the likeliest candidates. In the comments I shall make on these, please remember that I am dealing with only two factors—their power to vitalize or dynamize the believer and the likelihood that everyone can become a believer.

I have, of course, as a westerner, seen more of Christianity than of the others. Most Americans profess Church membership, and not to attend service every Sunday creates a suspicion of one's morality. A tremendous number subscribe to missionary societies and as America is the richest of countries this means that a huge effort is made to convert the rest of the world to one or other sect of Christianity. I have been impressed with the tremendous sincerity of some of our revivalists who draw crowds of many thousands. Judges are in the habit of requiring delinquent children on probation to attend Sunday Schools. Chaplains visit the prisons, and 'Alcoholics Anonymous' finds that prayer is a help in redeeming drunkards. In all this the great driving force is the emphasis on love as the primary commandment of Jesus, the identification of God with Love, and the exemplification of the spirit and practice of love in Jesus' life and death.

Nevertheless, since the twelfth century the control of the Church over Western mankind has steadily declined. (To be sure, this is partly because men have come to realize that the founder of Christianity was a simple, illiterate Jewish carpenter of poetic temperament, who believed that the world would end in a few years, but who had not the slightest interest in theological subtleties or ecclesiastical organization.) Church membership has grown in recent years but not religious zeal. It has been well said that the average American is kindly and sociable but not devout, is more ambitious to be a "good fellow than a good man." As to American intellectuals, if they are religious at all they may be Unitarians but seldom Catholics nor Fundamentalists.

This is generally attributed to the advancement of scientific thought among us. Science has, of course, discredited astronomical ideas implied in the *Bible*, made it difficult to believe that Joshua could have commanded the

sun and moon to stand still till a battle was finished, or that a fig tree would actually wither from being cursed by Jesus, etc.

Its effects, though, have been mostly indirect. Farmers practicing scientific agriculture, and, still more, operatives tending machines, turn more naturally to weather reports and mechanical appliances where primitive peasants would have supplicated the heavenly powers. Social workers concerned with family disintegration and juvenile delinquency seek their remedies in slum clearance and education. They wonder how a God without whose knowledge "no sparrow falls", and said to be interested in building moral personalities, can allow children to be born into homes where the father is a drunken brute and the mother a coarse prostitute.

Islam is a religion of tremendous driving power, spreading faster today than any other, especially through the missionary zeal of the Ahmaddiya Sect, in Africa. Their mystical branch, the Sufis, like the Christians identify God as *love*. Darvishes, working themselves up by means of the zikr, attain fanatical states in which they are anaesthetic to pain. The non-mystics identify Allah rather with Power; but seem little less successful in stirring up zealotry, as seen in such cases as the charge of the spear-armed followers of the "mad Mahdi" against the Gatling-gun-equipped British at Omdurman.

The first commandment which Mohammed laid down for every Muslim was the declaration of faith and praying five times a day, with prostrations and facing Mecca. Yet in the Muslim centers which have become modernized such as Karachi, Cairo, Ankara or Tehran, it is only in the mosques that you are likely ever to see a man praying. Jinnah was not given to doing so, Attaturk fought the Mullahs very hard because they opposed his reforms, and Mohammed Pahlevi, the father of the present Shah of

Iran, largely followed suit. Such of the leaders whom I have met in Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey and Iran and who are trying to modernize these countries were mostly religious skeptics.

Not that Islam has the problem which Christianity has in reconciling God's power and his goodness; for Islam defines goodness as whatever Allah decrees. If he decrees that an innocent creature he has made shall boil through all eternity in hell's lake of molten brass, then that *constitutes* goodness and justice; there is no contradiction. Also Islamic theology—the unity of God, and Mohammed superceding all earlier prophets—is much easier for an African aborigine to understand than the Christian three-persons-in-one Godhead plus Nicene and Apostolic *credos*.

The forces that are undermining Christianity are also doing the same to Islam. These forces are the spread of the fact-checking scientific spirit and growing mechanization of the way of life. In fact, because of the wealth and power which the physico-chemical sciences have given the West, the Orientals now look to these particular sciences to save the world, with the same exaggerated optimism as the Westerners did a century ago, but regarding which the west is becoming disillusioned.

Hinduism is known better to you than to me, besides which it is hard to generalize about it because it includes so many and such different sects. *Bhakti* is the form of worship which appears to me to offer the most vitalizing influence for those who can accept it, expressing as it does in *kirtans* the love for Rama and Krishna. On the other hand I was riding a few years ago on an Indian train and shared a compartment with a *babu* who took a more conservative view. When he learnt that I was American, he praised my country for the generosity of its aid program but deplored the lack of wisdom in the way the money was spent. America and India, he held, should form a team in

which America should supply the money and India should supply the wisdom regarding how to spend it. She would get this wisdom from the holy *Vedas*. But great care must be taken, he warned me, to assure that those who interpreted these *Vedas* should be absolutely orthodox.

This is all very well, but it is going to be very hard selling this idea to the American taxpayer. And I wonder whether even in your country, outside the circle to which my *babu* belonged and outside the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangha, it is going to be possible to arouse such a fervour of orthodoxy as will vitalize the nation. Otherwise, why has this not already happened? I have met several of your national leaders, and it did not seem to me that the most dynamic among them were the most orthodox.

Buddhism remains to be considered. The Buddha made compassion, together with enlightenment, the center of his teaching; and as in the case of Jesus, his life exemplified the spirit of love in all his human relationships. I don't find this presented to transgressors as much as the life and death of Jesus are in order emotionally to win them over and enthuse them. However, this could perhaps be done.

Buddhism seems a strong force in Southern Asia to restrain people from acts of violence and to make them gentle and kind. You notice these qualities particularly in Buddhist peoples. Buddhism has also the philosophic advantage that it does not require belief in a creator-god, with a consequent difficulty of explaining how a perfect being could have originated a world so imperfect as ours.

On the other hand, Buddhism appears to me to lack the dynamic power, possessed in particular by Christianity and Islam; and its outlook is so unworldly that it bestirs itself comparatively little to remedy the political chaos, the poverty, the over-population, the lack of medical care and sanitation and other crying problems of our times. When I see the inactivity of contemporary Buddhist leaders

in these matters, I become skeptical whether the vitalizing of our society can come from them.

To summarize, the power of religion to vitalize society depends on the two factors: its capacity to enthuse its followers with the spirit of love, and its capacity to be taken seriously by the men of our age. Neither of these qualities can be determined by theological or philosophical disputation—they are questions for psychology and statistical sociology. And the psychological influences of our age of scientific investigation, universal education and mechanical occupation are not favorable to revealed religion.

It is time I presented my own nearest approach to a solution. I am afraid it is neither a very dramatic one nor altogether new; but for what it is worth, here it is in three rules.

1. *Orientation* : As the guide in which to place faith, I suggest in place of ancient traditions, sacred scriptures or the words of Marx and Lenin, trust in Science, with especial effort at keeping oneself informed in the expanding sciences of man.

2. *Socialization* : If only for our own happiness, let us try to grow away from self centeredness by governing all behavior—as a student or teacher, as a citizen of our own community and of the world, as a worker, as a unit in a family, as an individual among friends, or whatever—in accord with dedication to ethical service rather than gain. What we strenuously study to do skillfully tends to become our nature.

3. *Individuation and integration* : Lastly, in order to perform these duties effectively, let us try to keep ourselves up to the mark in physique, will power, self-understanding and steadily glowing enthusiasm.

These three rules I believe to be the answer for the individual, and it is individuals who comprise the community.

INDEX

INDEX

- Ach, 74
 acuity of senses, 5
 Adler, Alfred, 81
 adrenalin, 54
 adultery, 42
 affective, 4
 aggressivity, 60, 73
 agriculture, scientific, 89
 Ahmaddiya, 89
 Ainu aborigines, 24
 alcoholism, 55, 56, 58
 Alcoholics Anonymous, 56, 88
 Alexander, 12, 82
 allo-erotic, 2, 3
 American intellectuals, 88
 American Medical Association, 84
 anaesthesia, 77
 anaesthetic, 89
 anal erotism, 2
Analysis of Dreams, 80
 Analytical Psychology, 81
 animal magnetism, 76
 Ankor Wat, 70
 Aquinas, 10
 archetypes, 81
 arch urges, 2
 Aristotle, 9, 10, 12
 athletes, 64
 athletic type, 53
 Attaurk, 89
 auto-erotic, 2
 auto-suggestion, 77
 Avicenna, 10

 Baboons, 40
 babu, 90
 Bacon, 12
 Baines, 68
 beauty, 65
 beef, 64
 behaviorism, 13
 believers, 87

 Benedict, Ruth, 28, 41
 Berman, 54
 Bernheim, 76
bhakti, 90
 Binet, 77
 biological momentum, 16
 biological needs, 3
 birth trauma, 82
 blastula, 53
 Bowlby, 46
Brahman, 81
 Braid, 76
 Breuer, 79
 Buddha, the, 78
 Buddhism, 19, 87
 Burma, 42

 Calypso, 50
 cancer, 54
 Cannon, 54
 cardio-vascular system, 53
 carpet-bag, politics, 26
 caste, 24
 catharsis, 80
 Catholic, 10, 37
 Cathell, J. McKeen, 13
 censor, 15, 72
 character, 71
 character reading, 52
 Charcot, 76, 79
 charlatan, 78, 82
 chateaux, 70
 children, 49
 chimpanzees, 41
 choleric, 53
 Chrobach, 79
 Church control, 87
 Church membership, 88
 cigar, phallic symbolism of, 36
 cigarettes, 57
 clairvoyance, 6
 clinical psychology, 14

- cognitive, 4
 Communism, 28
 companions, 48
 compensate, 72
 completion, tests, 69
 conation, 4, 73
 conscience, 14
 configuration, 66
 conscience, 14
 contemporary architecture, 70
 conversion, 73
 cotton, 25
 cotyledons, 1
 couch, 80
 Coué, 77
 cretinism, 55
 criminal types, 50
 crushes, 42
 cult, 82

 Darvishes, 89
 Darwin, 14
 delinquent, 23
 del Sarto, Andrea, 68
 democracy, 27, 28
 depth-psychology, 35
 detention, 23
 displacement, 72
 doctor should be analysed, 83
 doctor's freedom, 83
Dreams, The Analysis of, 80
 drink, 57
 drugs, 60
 drunkards, 88

 Earp, 59
 ectomorph, 53
 education, 21
 effector system, 1
 efferent nerve chains, 3
 ego, 14
 ego instincts, 3
 Egyptian, 24
 encouraging the position, 4
 endoderm, 53
 endomorph, 53
 environment, 82
 Eros, 1, 2
 Esdaille, 76
 Esquimaux, 42
 ethnocentric, 26
 evil spirits, 76
 excess population, 38
 exhibitionist, 11
 exorcism, 76

 Faeces, 2
 father's role, 48
 fear, 20
 Fehner, 13
 fecundity, 37
 Ferenczi, 82
 fig tree cursed, 89
 five senses, 3
 firmness, 46
 Flugel, J. C., 33
 foreconscious, 15
 forces undermining religion, 90
 Fracker, 52
 free association, 4
 Fries, 83
 Freud, S., 1, 14, 62, 67, 74, 79-83
 Freud, Anna, 82
 Freudian dynamics, 15
 frustration, 2, 71, 72
 Fudd, 52

 "g" 10
 Gadarene swine, 76
 Gall, 51
 genius, intellectual, 14
gestalt, 66
 gibbons, 41
 Gilboit, 52
 glandular functioning, 54
 Glover, Dr. Edward, 58, 60
 gothic, 70
 Greece, 10
 Greeks, 43, 67
 gregarious animals, 40

- grief, 63
- group marriage, 42
- group therapy, 85
- guilt culture, 14
- gymnastic apparatus, 65
- Hamlet*, 69
- Hans, Der Kluge, 5
- hate, 20
- hate, the lie from, 20-21
- Hedonists, Psychological, 74
- hereditary endowment, 45
- Hering, 13
- heroin, 60
- heterosexual, 33
- heterosexual drive, 58
- Hinduism, 19
- Hitler, Adolf, 27
- home and mother, 36
- homo sapiens*, 41
- homosexual, 3, 57
- "hooked", 60
- Horney, Karen, 82
- Hull, 59
- hypersensibility, 6
- hypnotism 51, 76, 77
- Hypocrates, 53
- id*, 14, 74
- ideas, 64
- imagination, 20
- impotent, 58
- improvements, 81
- incredulity, 81
- individual psychology, 81
- individuation, 92
- infantile sexuality, 81, 82
- inferiority complex, 81
- instinct a guide to food, 63
- intelligence, laws of, 10
- introspectionism, 13
- Islam's driving power, 89
- James, W., 13, 32, 74
- Janet, 76
- jealousy, 21
- Jesus, 76, 89
- Jinnah, 89
- Jones, 14, 73, 77, 83
- Joshua, 88
- Judaism, 19
- Jung, Karl, C., 81
- Karma*, 75
- Kepler, 12
- kivians*, 90
- Kretschmer, 53
- Klu Klux Klan, 26
- Kush, the vile, 24
- Kwakiutl, 42
- La Suggestibilité*, 77
- latent content, 80
- Lavater, 50
- Lenin, 29
- Leonardo, 68
- Leptosomes, 53
- libido, 2, 56
- lie, the whopping, 27
- Liebault, 76
- limen, of consciousness, 35
- Lincoln, 25
- Lombroso, 50
- Los Angeles Psycho-analytic Society, 82
- lying, 19
- MacDougal, 4
- machine operatives, 89
- "Mad Mahdi" 89
- Maha Devi, 40
- malfunctioning, 62
- manifest content, 80
- "manly protest" 81
- Malinovsky, 41
- Malthus, law of, 13
- marijuana, 60
- marriage, test of a, 45
- masochism, 32, 64
- massai, 43

INDEX

- ochistic, 73
- ernal deprivation 46
- ernity home, 46
- .d, Margaret, 42
- hanisms, unhealthy, 15
- litation, 78
- ancholic, 53
- odern, 53
- omorph, 53
- hotte & Prum, 74
- enjodaro, 69
- ia Liza, 68
- ikeys, 40
- ogamous mating, 41
- al breakdown, 22
- al condemnation, 25
- al rules, 75
- ale, 87
- bi, 73, 78
- phy, 73
- her's role, 47-48
- ivation analyst, 35
- ivational research, 36
- lding the child, 45
- th erotism, 59
- nsterberg, 5
- lim Arabs, 10
- solini, 28
- an, 59

- icy, 76, 77
- oleon, 55
- cissism, 2, 45, and health, 65
- cissistic motive, 40
- ural, 5
- ure, Mother, 39
- ro, 24
- vstatter, 55
- ple, 56
- e-taking, 8

- ipus complex, 33
- ipus Rex*, 69
- Testament*, 65
- ated cigarettes, 61

- opium dens, 61
- optimum population, 37
- oral erotism, 2, 56, 57
- Orata, 52
- orectic processes, 13
- organic inferiority, 81
- orgiastic, 2
- oriental religions, 81
- orientation, 92
- orphanages, 47
- overcompensation, 81

- Packard, Vance, 60
- Pahlevi, Mohammed, 89
- Paracelsus, 76
- paranoiac, 28
- payola, 34
- penology, 23
- personality, 71, 80
- personality, building qualities in cars, 35.
- Pestalozzi, 79
- perversions, 11
- Phallic symbolism, 39, 59, 70
- phlegmatic, 53
- phobia of low temperatures, 64
- phrenologists, 51
- physiognomists, 50
- Pinel, 76
- pipe, a man with, 59
- poise, 60
- polygamy, 42
- polygamous, 40
- Polynesians, 42
- Popenoe, Paul, 44
- porpoises, 16
- pressure, 73, therapy, 75
- probing, 73, 78
- profit, lie from hope of, 20, 21
- profit-motive, 25, 34
- projection, 15, 72
- promiscuity, 42
- propaganda, 21
- protection of young, 40
- protuberances in

- the brain, 52
- psycho-genesis, 73
- psychology, 13, 17
- psycho-analysis, 77
- psycho-analytic associations, 82
- psychological esthetics, 67
- pyknics, 53

- Racial unconscious, 81
- Rank, 82
- Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangha, 91
- rationalization, 15
- Readers Digest*, 34
- receptor organs, 3
- reflexes, 4
- regressions, 77
- religion, 56, 87
- repetition-compulsion, 1
- repression, 79
- Rhine, Dr., 6
- Robertson-Smith, 41
- Rohrschach test, 68
- royal road to the unconscious, 81
- rita*, 69

- Sadism, 32, 64
- sadistic triumph, 65
- Salpetriere, 76
- Salvation Army, 56
- sanguine, 53
- sattipatthana, 78, 79
- Saul, 62
- scandal-monger, 21
- Scandinavia, 87
- scapegoating, 27
- schools, 49
- science, 12
- scoptophilia, 12
- secretiveness, 20
- segregationism, 24
- Sexual and Social Life of Apes and Monkeys*, 40
- sex impulse, 36, 81
- shame-culture, 14, 17

- Sheldon, 53
- Sherrington, 54
- slavery, 24, 25
- Skulratana Col., 61
- socialization, 17, 92
- society for Medical Psycho-analysis, 82
- socio-drama, 84
- Socrates, 8, 78
- sodium pentathol, 84
- Southard, Dr. E. H., 73
- spanking, 22
- Spearman, 5
- special state licencing, 84
- speech, 18, 19
- spinach, 63
- Spurzheim, 51
- Stalin, 28
- stammering, 63
- stigmata, 62
- stone age, 68
- stuttering, 19
- sublimation, 73
- sucking nipple, 56
- Sufis, 89
- sugar, cane, 63
- suggestibility, 77
- super-ego, 14, 17, 74
- superstitious, health, 64
- Switzerland, 87
- symbol, 16,
- symptoms, 77
- symptom-comparing, 65

- Taboo against frankness, 79
- talking-drugs, 84
- tape-recording, 84
- tastes, 3
- teacher, 49
- telepathy, 6
- temperament, 71
- temperaments, 54
- Thanatos, 1, 3, 63
- Thebes, 70
- thematic apperception tests, 69